

AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXII. No. 5 }
WHOLE No. 531 }

NOVEMBER 15, 1919

\$4.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS

Chronicle

Home News:—The reservations to the Peace Treaty, recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee came up for discussion on November 7. The preamble was

adopted on the same day by a vote of 48 to 40, four Senators in favor of it pairing with four against it. The text of the preamble, which remained in its original form despite several efforts to have it amended, is as follows:

The reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate are to be made a part and condition of the resolution of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate have been accepted by an exchange of notes as a part and condition of said resolution of ratification by at least three of the four principal Allied and Associated Powers, to wit, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan.

On the following day, November 8, the withdrawal reservation was passed by a vote of 50 to 35. It is said that, if the Senators who were paired or absent had voted, the vote would have been 55 for the reservation and 41 against it. The text of the reservation as adopted follows:

The United States so understands and construes Article 1 that in case of notice of withdrawal from the League of Nations, as provided in said article, the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations and all its obligations under the said covenant have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal by the United States may be given by a concurrent resolution of the Congress of the United States.

On November 13 the Senate adopted the reservation to Article X, which is substantially the same as the proposal declared by President Wilson to be a knife-thrust at the heart of the treaty. The vote was 46 to 33. Eight Senators for the reservation paired with eight Senators against it. As adopted the reservation reads:

The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between nations—whether members of the League or not—under the provisions of Article X, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of

the military or naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so provide.

Before the reservation to Article X. had been carried, there were signs of an attempt at a filibuster with a view to postponing indefinitely the vote of ratification. As a consequence the closure rule was invoked on November 15 by a vote of 76 to 16, and in virtue of it the Senate, Mr. Lodge declared, would not proceed to any other legislative business until the treaty was out of the way. On November 15 the discussion of the reservations was resumed, and according to the closure rule, each Senator was limited to one hour. Ten reservations were passed. The text follows:

No mandate shall be accepted by the United States under Article 22, Part 1, or any other provision of the treaty of peace with Germany, except by action of the Congress of the United States.

The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction and declares that all domestic and political questions relating wholly or in part to its internal affairs, including immigration, labor, coastwise traffic, the tariff, commerce, the suppression of traffic in women and children, and in opium and other dangerous drugs, and all other domestic questions, and all questions affecting the present boundaries of the United States and its insular and other possessions, are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States and are not under this treaty to be submitted in any way either to arbitration or to the consideration of the council or of the assembly of the League of Nations or any agency thereof or to the decision or recommendation of any power.

The United States will not submit to arbitration or to inquiry by the Assembly or by the Council of the League of Nations, provided for in said treaty of peace, any questions which in the judgment of the United States depend upon or relate to its long-established policy commonly known as the Monroe Doctrine; said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone and is hereby declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of said League of Nations and entirely unaffected by any provision contained in the said treaty of peace with Germany.

The United States withholds its assent to Articles 156, 157 and 158 and reserves full liberty of action with respect to any controversy which may arise under said articles between the Republic of China and the Empire of Japan.

The Congress of the United States will provide by law for the appointment of the representatives of the United States in the Assembly and the Council of the League of Nations and may in its discretion provide for the participation of the United States in any commission, committee, tribunal, court, council, or conference, or in the selection of any members thereof, and for

the appointment of members of said commissions, committees, tribunals, courts, councils, or conferences, or any other representatives under the treaty of peace, or in carrying out its provisions, and until such participation and appointment have been so provided for and the powers and duties of such representatives have been defined by law no person shall represent the United States under either said League of Nations or the treaty of peace with Germany or be authorized to perform any act for or on behalf of the United States thereunder, and no citizen of the United States shall be selected or appointed as a member of said commissions, committees, tribunals, courts, councils, or conferences, except with the approval of the Senate of the United States.

"The United States understands that the Reparation Commission will regulate or interfere with exports from the United States to Germany, or from Germany to the United States, only when the United States by act or joint resolution of Congress approves such regulation or interference.

The United States shall not be obligated to contribute to any expenses of the League of Nations, or of the secretariat, or of any commission, or committee, or conference, or other agency organized under the League of Nations or under the treaty for the purpose of carrying out the treaty provisions, unless and until an appropriation of funds available for such expenses shall have been made by the Congress of the United States.

If the United States shall at any time adopt any plan for the limitation of armaments proposed by the Council of the League of Nations under the provisions of Article 8 it reserves the right to increase such armaments without the consent of the Council whenever the United States is threatened with invasion or engaged in war.

The United States reserves the right to permit, in its discretion, the nationals of a covenant-breaking State, as defined in Article 16 of the covenant of the League of Nations, residing within the United States or in countries other than that violating said Article 16, to continue their commercial, financial, and personal relations with the nationals of the United States.

Nothing in Articles 296, 297, or in any of the annexes thereto or in any other article, section or annex of the treaty of peace with Germany shall, as against citizens of the United States, be taken to mean any confirmation, ratification or approval of any act otherwise illegal or in contravention of the rights of citizens of the United States.

On November 17, the Senate defeated the last two reservations proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee. One of these proposed reservations provided that the United States should refuse to participate in the disposal of the German colonies, the other declared that questions affecting the honor and vital interests of the United States should not be submitted to the League of Nations.

Two more reservations were passed by the Senate on November 17. One of these reservations concerns the entrance of the United States into the International Labor Conference and reads as follows:

"The United States withholds its assent to Part XIII. (Articles 387 to 427, inclusive) of said treaty unless Congress, by act or joint resolution, shall hereafter make provision for representation in the organization established by said Part XIII, and in such event the participation of the United States will be governed and conditioned by the provisions of such act or joint resolution."

The other reservation, relative to equality of voting strength in the League, reads:

"The United States assumes no obligation to be bound by any election, decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly in which any member of the League and its self-governing dominions, colonies, or parts of empire, in the aggregate have cast more than one vote, and assumes no obligation to be bound by any decision, report, or finding of the council or assembly arising out of any dispute between the United States and any member of the League if such member, or any self-governing dominion, colony, empire or part of empire united with it politically has voted."

Since all other reservations were voted down, the way was now cleared for the final vote on the ratification of the treaty, and the Administration Senators appealed to the President for counsel as to the action he wished them to take. Mr. Wilson acceded to their request, and in a letter addressed to Senator Hitchcock said:

I should hesitate to offer [a word of counsel] in any detail, but I assume that the Senators only desire my judgment upon the all-important question of the final vote on the resolution containing the many reservations of Senator Lodge. On that I cannot hesitate, for, in my opinion, the resolution in that form does not provide for ratification but rather for nullification of the treaty. I sincerely hope that the friends and supporters of the treaty will vote against the Lodge resolution of ratification. I understand that the door will then probably be open for a genuine resolution of ratification. I trust that all true friends of the treaty will refuse to support the Lodge resolution.

On November 19, the Lodge resolution of ratification embodying the fifteen reservations, enumerated above, came up for consideration. This resolution was defeated by a vote of 39 to 55. Senator Reed then moved that the vote by which the resolution of ratification had been defeated should be reconsidered. This motion was carried by a vote of 62 to 30. After considerable parliamentary jockeying the resolution embodying the reservations was again put to the vote and again defeated by a vote of 41 to 50. Later Senator Underwood offered a substitute resolution of ratification without reservations. Senator Lodge allowed this resolution to be put to the vote and it was defeated by a vote of 38 to 53. This last vote completed the defeat of the treaty so far as the present session of Congress is concerned.

In order to pave the way for an independent treaty with Germany, Senator Lodge, before the adjournment of the Senate, offered the following concurrent resolution:

Whereas by resolution of Congress, adopted April 6, 1917, and by reason of acts committed by the then German Government, a state of war was declared to exist between that Government and the United States; and whereas the said acts of the German Government have long since ceased; and whereas by an armistice signed November 11, 1918, hostilities between Germany and the Allied and Associated Powers were terminated; and whereas by the terms of the treaty of Versailles Germany is to be at peace with all the nations engaged in war against her whenever three Governments, designated therein, have ratified said treaty; now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) that the said state of war between Germany and the United States is hereby declared to be at an end.

No action was taken on this resolution for the reason that the House had already adjourned; it will come up for consideration at the next session of Congress, which will begin on December 1, 1919. The Senate adjourned on November 19. It is said that, unless the President decides to submit once more the Versailles treaty to the Senate before action is taken on the Lodge concurrent resolution, peace can be effected with Germany only by negotiating a new treaty.

Judge Anderson of Indianapolis, on November 8, issued a temporary mandatory injunction directing the officials of the United Mine Workers of America to withdraw and cancel before 6 p. m.,

The Coal Strike on November 11, the strike order under which more than 400,000 miners, on November 1, quit work. This injunction was issued after the Federal Government and the counsel for the miners had presented their case in the Federal civil court. Judge Anderson ruled that the strike call was illegal:

I think the Lever act is constitutional. I think that it is in force. I have made up my mind to that plainly—no doubt about it. I think clearly that it prohibits the very thing that these defendants are doing and makes it unlawful. I think the Government is right in going to its own courts and in a peaceable, orderly method asking to have its rights vindicated. I think that the Clayton act does not apply at all; that the Lever act so far as this particular case is concerned, if it did apply, supersedes it; that this restraining order ought to be made a temporary injunction, and that there ought to be added to it a direct order to these people to cancel that strike order, and if you have not already drawn one, you may draw an order of that kind. The Government is supreme even to the labor unions.

Judge Anderson declared the strike to be "about the most lawless thing in the country." "If the strike conspiracy to reduce the coal output could be carried out, it would be rebellion." Holding that it was the part of the Government, and not the workers, to decide whether the Lever act was still in force, and that the Government had so decided, and that it was therefore the law of the land, Judge Anderson said:

This case involves solely the question of enforcing the law. It is my absolute duty to uphold the law, which no one man and no body of men has the right to override. Were we to admit to even the slightest degree a contrary right, we would undermine the foundations of the Republic. The Government is right in seeking to uphold its own laws and in asking its courts to aid it. These men have done an illegal act from which irreparable injury results to the complainant.

The agreement by the violation of which the strikers are said to have broken their contract, was submitted by the Fuel Administrator, the Hon. H. A. Garfield, to mine workers and mine operators; it was signed by official representatives of the workers on May 11, 1918, and by official representatives of the operators on May 13, 1918. It was approved by the Fuel Administrator

on May 15, 1918. The duration of the agreement is defined in the following clause:

The provisions of this agreement shall govern the parties hereto, from the date of the approval hereof by the United States Fuel Administrator during the continuance of the war, and in any event for at least two years, and thereafter subject to revision upon ninety days notice by either of the parties.

It is alleged, therefore, that even in the supposition that the war automatically ended with the armistice, a supposition which Judge Anderson in view of the explicit statement of the Government to the contrary, refused to admit, the mine workers are bound by their signed agreement to continue the operation of the mines until May 15, 1920. Judge Anderson's ruling that the Clayton act did not apply was based on his interpretation that the said act, though it gives a statutory guarantee of the right to strike, did not contemplate the right to strike in cases where to do so would involve the commission of crime. In the present instance, he said, not only was the strike illegal, but its continuance in the face of the statutes of the United States and the orders of its courts would be rebellion.

The issuance of the injunction was followed the next day by a meeting of the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor, at which a statement was drawn up and given to the press, the most important part of which is as follows:

By all the facts in the case, the miners' strike is justified. We indorse it. We are convinced of the justice of the miners' cause. We pledge to the miners the full support of the American Federation of Labor, and appeal to the workers and the citizenship of our country to give like indorsement and aid to the men engaged in this momentous struggle.

After exposing the hazardous, isolated and unhealthy conditions of the miners' work, the instability of their employment, the special pressure on them of the difficulties involved in the high cost of living, the unavailing efforts they had made to secure the amelioration of their lot and the refusal of the employers to discuss the case, the Federation proceeded to stigmatize the action of the Government in the matter of the strike as an "autocratic action . . . of such a nature that it staggers the human mind."

The restraining order, by which the officials of the labor organization were prohibited from contributing their own money to procure food for women and children who might be starving, and from in any way entering into conversation with the men on strike, was declared by the Federation to be calculated to shock the sensibilities and awaken the resentment of the nation. The use of the injunction was characterized as a thing for which there was no warrant in the law of the land, in no wise contemplated by the Lever Food and Fuel Control act; it was asserted, moreover, that assurance was given by Mr. Palmer's predecessor that the action taken by Mr. Palmer would not be taken. The Federation declared that labor must be free, that its burdens

should not be made more onerous by the war, and that the instrumentalities by which the conditions of labor are improved must not be blocked or checked:

We declare that the proceedings in this case are unwarranted, and they are unparalleled in the history of our country, and we declare that it is an injustice which not only the workers, but all liberty-loving Americans will repudiate and demand redress. The citizenship of our country cannot afford to permit the establishment or maintenance of a principle which strikes at the very foundation of justice and freedom. To restore confidence in the institutions of our country and the respect due our courts, this injunction should be withdrawn and the records cleansed from so outrageous a proceeding.

In reply to the statement of the Federation, the Attorney-General, on November 10, made public the following declaration:

The coal strike is a plain violation of a Federal statute. This has been the Government's position from the start. The President declared it to be unlawful and the court, after full hearing, has now declared it to be unlawful. All I can say is that the law will be enforced. This same law has been enforced many times, and the Department of Justice has other cases now pending which were brought under it. The merits of the controversy between the operators and the miners are not involved in the court proceedings at Indianapolis, neither is the right to strike. Nothing that the Government has done is intended or designed to have any effect upon the recognized right of labor to organize, to bargain collectively through its unions, and, under ordinary industrial conditions, to walk out by concerted action.

The proposal by the President of a peaceful settlement of the matters at issue between the operators and the miners, through negotiations or arbitration, was rejected, and the Government, therefore, faced the alternative of submitting to the demands of a single group, to the irreparable injury of the whole people, or of challenging the assertion by that group of power greater than that of the Government itself. Confronted with such a choice, the Government's duty was perfectly clear: it refused to surrender to the dictation of a group and it proposes to assert its power to protect itself and the people, whom it is designed to serve. The Government is no respecter of persons in the enforcement of the law.

Those who conceive that the resolutions of a convention or the orders of the officers of any organization in the country, whether labor organization or any other, are superior in authority to the law of the land, will find themselves mistaken. I assume that the order of the court will be obeyed. The President's offer for a peaceful settlement is still open and I hope that the miners and operators will now get together and settle their controversy.

On the same day Senator La Follette had the Federation's statement entered into the *Congressional Record*, and a discussion ensued in the Senate, during which Senator Myers declared the present time to be the most serious in the country since 1861, and advocated settling the issue at once without compromise.

Notwithstanding the declaration of the Federation of Labor, the officials of the United Mine Workers drew up an order withdrawing and canceling the strike order, and after having submitted it for approval to Judge Anderson, communicated it to the strikers, who, with the exception of some local recalcitrants, began at once

to return to their work. The employers suggested a conference with the officials of the Mine Workers, but the latter had already accepted the Government's invitation to a conference at Washington. The Attorney-General sent word to the miners that he wished to be informed if any of the operators refused to allow the strikers to resume the operation of the mines, and he declared that he would bring action in such case against the employers for interfering with the production of coal. The official representatives of the miners met the representatives of the operators at Washington on November 14, and it is expected that a compromise will be reached before the conference closes its session.

Ireland:—As is to be expected under the circumstances, Ireland is still restless. During the week soldiers and civilians clashed several times. Despite this, the Government showed no disposition to relieve the situation, but rather aggravated it by announcing that after a certain date the use of motor cars would be forbidden. The Irish were further incensed by false reports given to the press about conditions obtaining in the country.

The so-called religious problem which has no existence outside the minds of Carson and his followers was lately much to the fore. If the statements of the Unionists were taken at their face value Ulster would appear entirely Protestant and Unionist, whereas in fact five of the Ulster counties are quite Catholic, while in the four other countries there is a substantial minority of Catholics. Relative to this the following table of percentages is interesting:

County	Protestants	Catholics
Antrim	79.5	20.5
Down	68.4	31.6
Armagh	54.7	45.3
Derry	54.2	45.8
Average	64.2	35.8
Cavan	18.5	81.5
Donegal	21.1	78.9
Monaghan	25.3	74.7
Fermanagh	43.8	56.2
Tyrone	44.6	55.4
Average percentage	30.7	69.3

Politically the case is briefly this: before the Great War Ulster was Nationalist not Unionist; now, the districts are divided as follows: East Donegal, Northeast Tyrone, South Armagh, South Down and nine Belfast seats are Nationalist: North Derry, South Derry, North Antrim, Mid Antrim, East Antrim, South Antrim, North Down, Mid Down, East Down, West Down, North Armagh, Mid Armagh, South Tyrone North Fermanagh are Unionist; North Donegal, West Donegal, South Donegal, Northwest Tyrone, South Fermanagh, North Monaghan, South Monaghan, East Cavan, West Cavan are Sinn Fein. In other words thirteen districts and nine Belfast seats, Sinn Fein and Nationalist, stand against fourteen Unionist districts.

Modern Popular Education

JAMES J. WALSH, M. D., PH. D.

THE report of one of the members of the French *Commission des Monuments Historiques*, who has been making an investigation of the devastated art of northern France, brought out particularly the fact that the great majority of the people of the Middle Ages, among whom originated the art discussed in AMERICA on October 4, must have been rather deeply affected by it. We have known that from other quarters for many years. We have the receipted bills of village blacksmiths and village carpenters for wrought iron and carved woodwork, which we now look upon as works of art. Whenever a bench end or a door hinge or latch from this medieval period is no longer to be used, instead of being relegated to the scrap heap, it is sent straight away to one of the national or municipal museums, there to be exhibited for the sake of the inspiration and the stimulus that it may afford. As the Rev. Augustus Jessopp says in his chapter on "Parish Life in England" in his book "Before the Great Pillage," medieval progress in art did not confine itself to France: "We get fairly bewildered by the astonishing wealth of skill and artistic taste and æsthetic feeling which there must have been in this England of ours in times which till lately we had assumed to be barbaric times."

The main difference between medieval and modern popular education is basic. Our purpose is to develop the intellect and above all the memory, their purpose was to bring out whatever was in the man and develop his powers. If they had not succeeded in doing this, we should not have the magnificent heritage of art products that we have. Europe did not have one-tenth of the population that it has at the present time, but it had ten times as much power to accomplish things that the world will never willingly let die, and deeply regrets whenever anything happens to destroy them. We have felt that if everyone could be got to read and write, then popular education would have done much. Indeed, we hear so much about illiteracy that reading and writing have come to represent essential elements in education. It is very interesting to realize that a large proportion of the people who made the beautiful things we now envy and many others who appreciated them so thoroughly could not read and write. It is still more interesting to take by contrast the fact that a great many people who can read and write have no taste, no standards of appreciation and have just enough superficial power of absorbing other people's opinions to make them think that they think.

Fortunately there is a typical example at hand that illustrates very well just what a standard of popular education, in so far as it sets up reading and writing as the most important element in it, leads to. One of Mr. Harold Bell Wright's novels has just made its appear-

ance. The publishers announce an advance sale for the new story of 600,000 copies. In other words, when it was announced that a new book by Mr. Wright was to appear, book sellers throughout the country placed orders for 600,000 copies, perfectly confident from their previous experience with the sale of his books, that they would be able to sell at least that many, for novels are no longer returnable but all ordered must be paid for. No wonder when that the publishers went on and printed 750,000 copies as the first edition of the new novel. Their previous experience with Mr. Wright's books might very well have justified that, for altogether some 8,000,000 copies of Harold Bell Wright's novels have been called for and many of the previous issues still continued to sell so well that they are all in print and likely to continue so for some time.

Here evidently is the favorite writer of our generation. It is perfectly sure that the readers of his books are not foreigners nor as a rule the first generation born in this country. They come from the older stocks who have enjoyed the privileges of American liberty and American popular education for several generations at least and some of them for many generations. They are people who are sufficiently well-to-do to buy the books they read or to feel at least that they can afford to spend the money on such precious treasures as Mr. Wright's books. Most of them have opinions about a great many subjects and feel that their opinions are just as good as those of anybody else. Perhaps they have a suspicion that they are a little better.

My own first serious stimulus with regard to how much I was missing by not reading Mr. Wright's book came in New England when at the end of a forum talk I was questioned as to my acquaintance with the most popular of living novelists. I had ventured to say that the first novel ever written in English, "Robinson Crusoe," was the best novel ever written in English and that our second best English novel was "Gulliver's Travels" which happened to be the second novel written in the language. Greatly daring, in spite of the universal persuasion that men are always doing things better and that therefore surely with all the novels which we have at the present time there must be some great ones among them, I had ventured to say that no novel written in the last generation was expected to live by anyone who know anything about the matter, while the greatest novel ever written, "Don Quixote," was finished some 300 years ago by a Spanish literary man, in the straits of dire poverty, dying of dropsy in Madrid, in the summer time, with doctors refusing to allow him any water in one of the driest climates in the world.

One of my younger auditors, evidently fresh from the high school, boldly asked me if I had ever read Harold

Bell Wright's books, and when I confessed and did not deny that I had not, I was told that they were the greatest books ever written and their immense sale showed how thoroughly appreciative the American public was of merit. It was even suggested, shades of New England worthies! that high school principals commended them as models of style and literature to their classes who no longer had to occupy themselves with the dry as dust lucubrations of ancient classics written out of sympathy with our time. The statement was something of an anticlimax and I was sure that a singular principal had become plural principals in accordance with the usual tendency of youth to generalize from the particular. I was in Massachusetts, however, and so I took my lesson smilingly, knowing that it is the mission of the dear old Bay State to teach all men.

In the light of this it is interesting to have current critical opinion with regard to Mr. Wright's books. A reviewer in a recent number of the *New York Times Book Review* said:

But it would be difficult to imagine a mushier, more ridiculous mess set forth as a book of fiction than "The Re-Creation of Brian Kent". As fiction, it possesses hardly one saving grace. Its people are impossible, its story lame and creaky, its sentiment mawkish, and as a whole it is absurd. But it will appeal to and delight hundreds of thousands of its predestined audiences just because its people are impossible and its sentiment mawkish. They would be bored or bewildered by a higher grade of fictional art and cast it aside as "too highbrow for them".

This seems rather harsh criticism and it might possibly be thought that it represented an individual biased opinion, but I do not think that there is a subject in the whole domain of criticism on which there is a more marvelous harmony of opinion than in the condemnation of Mr. Wright's books so far as they are supposed to represent literature. It is undeniable that the book columns of certain newspapers have had rather fulsome praise of Mr. Wright, for instance a Western journal declared that "it is his almost clairvoyant power of reading the human soul that has made Mr. Wright's books among the most remarkable of the present age," but then there must be something wrong about this for there are quite literally no human souls in the Wright

books at all. He himself has told of his method of writing novels and he confessed that "up to the last copying not a character has been named, they were called in the copy Greed, Ambition, Youth or whatever they represented to me in the writing of the story": The characters are not human beings, they are stalking horses for Mr. Wright's abstract ideas. Mr. Percy Mackaye declared that Mr. Wright's confession made it manifest "that he was guilty of bearing false witness against his fellow man". One of the Philadelphia papers suggested once, the sentence will be found among the advertisements of Mr. Wright's books, that Mr. Wright was the legitimate successor of Dante and Shakespeare in our generation. Of course that was said for revenue only. Newspapers that conduct book "coliums" also have publishers' advertisements and they expect to swell their advertising by saying nice things about books that are advertised. The comparison is such an absurdity that it is surprising that it was accepted as serious even by the publishers.

Mr. George Gordon, writing on the "Men Who Make Our Novels" (Moffat Yard & Co., 1919), and comparing this most popular of our novelists here in America with our other writers of novels, says that "with the most meagre equipment Mr. Wright has made his name a byword in the land to all such critics as I am presumed to be (haughty and proud)". But then what difference does that make so long as he has also made his name "a blessing to the thousands upon thousands who crave to see their humble doings, their paper fantasies exalted and made memorable in the bright guise of a seeming romance". What Mr. Wright writes about is living, but not life. He writes about things and not human beings. Some of AMERICA's readers may recall the fact that I once suggested that the difference between literature and twaddle is just that, literature concerns life, and twaddle is about things. Try our most popular novelist by that criterion and see the result, but also judge at the same time what our modern popular education is accomplishing. It is just making it possible for people to waste time without compunction, to have opinions without thinking, to think that they think when they are using only the lowest of our mental faculties, the memory, which we share to so striking an extent with the animals.

Zanzibar Redivivus

FLOYD KEELER

RECENT dispatch from England announces that "the Bishop of Zanzibar (Dr. Frank Weston) who arrived in England quite recently, from his remote diocese in South East Africa, on furlough owing to ill-health, has lost no time in reviving old controversies." This announcement may not connote anything to the mind of the casual reader, but to one who has followed matters Anglican for the past five years it is a most in-

teresting bit of news. Dr. Weston, who represents the most "advanced" section of Anglicanism, first came into prominence in the famous Kikuyu controversy. In a neighboring mission field in East Africa two of his brother Bishops held a great union service in a Presbyterian place of worship and Bishop Tucker of Uganda there celebrated the Holy Communion, admitting to participation in that service the Presbyterians and members

of other denominations who were present. The whole procedure was contrary to usual Anglican practice and was especially distressing to Dr. Weston and men of his type. He saw in it the complete subversion of all for which he had been contending, and with the true shepherd's instinct for the protection of his flock, he made vigorous protest to the Archbishop of Canterbury, appealing for a decision as to the lawfulness of the Kikuyu action. This protest he addressed in an open letter and the burden of it was a categorical demand expressed in one sentence therein. "What does *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand for?" What might have been the result under normal circumstances is conjectural, though threats of schism and other things were freely expressed while it was uppermost in English ecclesiastical minds, but before the matter had time to come to anything the Great War broke out and England was concerned with a life and death struggle for her own existence. The question became not "what does *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand for?" but will she be able to stand at all? Everyone from the Archbishop of Canterbury on down agreed to drop their differences until these more momentous matters were decided.

Bishop Weston, whose field lay largely in German East Africa, found himself thrust into the midst of the war and donning the khaki did loyal and conscientious service as chaplain with the British forces in the field. Kikuyu seemed to pass by and be forgotten. But Kikuyu was not the only difficulty which confronted the Bishop of Zanzibar. It was near at hand and the report of what went on there would undoubtedly scandalize his converts, but in England itself he saw heresy raising its hideous form, and true knight-errant that he is, he raised his voice in protest once again. The Bishop of Hereford, a pronounced latitudinarian, had written a book and made statements which amounted to a practical denial of the Divinity of our Blessed Lord. To Bishop Weston such a thing was, naturally, intolerable, and true to Catholic principles, he proceeded to pronounce his excommunication against the Bishop of Hereford, and to proclaim to the world that he would henceforth "hold no communication in holy things" with his brother Bishop. This was regarded with a sort of amused tolerance by English broad-churchmen and even those who agreed with Dr. Weston and who applauded his bravery of action felt that since Zanzibar and Hereford were many miles apart, the danger of their respective Bishops being required to communicate was rather remote. Anglicanism is used to displays of "heroics" and has ceased to take them very seriously; such storms usually blow over. But now Bishop Weston returns to England on an indefinite furlough and rumor has it that he is likely to be offered a home bishopric. How long he will be able to stay in an English See and keep out of the way of those who teach what he holds to be heretical, remains to be seen. Denials of the fundamental facts of the Creeds are rife in England, and these denials are no bar to prefer-

ment. In his most recent letter Bishop Weston says that

At the moment there sits upon the bench of Bishops a man whose writings set forth his claim to criticize our Blessed Lord's "normal Jewish mind" and to correct His "superstitions". Not only did several Bishops advocate and share in his consecration; the whole body of Bishops welcomed him to its counsels.

And in saying this he is telling no secret, for everyone knows it to be true. At the same time he is leveling his lance at the Bishop of Bath and Wells, whom he accuses of insisting on the obedience of his clergy to himself rather than to the Person of our Lord. This is in connection with the Bishop's recent pronouncement against the service of "Benediction" which is becoming more and more common in Anglican Churches. The Bishop of Zanzibar says: "In my judgment there is no doctrine implied under the rite of Benediction that is not fully authorized by the formularies of the Church of England." Most of his fellow Bishops think there is. The question still is, "What does *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand for?" And it is a question which is not confined to any one part of Anglicanism.

Within the past few weeks there comes a report from the Philippines which shows that there also the question has reared its head. More than fifteen years ago an American Protestant Episcopal missionary, the Rev. John A. Staunton, went to a wild region in the mountains of Luzon and began a missionary work whose success has been phenomenal in Protestant Episcopal annals. This work was not a proselyting mission. To Bishop Brent's credit be it said that he did not permit the shameless methods which have characterized most Protestant missions in the Islands, but counseled his men to confine themselves to those who were not Christians at all. This work at Sagada was a virgin field, among savage, pagan head-hunters. Here "Father" Staunton, as he is lovingly known by his people, has labored during this decade and a half, refusing furloughs, and leading a life of the utmost self-sacrifice. To the people he has taught Catholic doctrines, and has led them in Catholic practices. The altar and the tabernacle are the center of their devotions, the statue of our Lady is garlanded with flowers from these simply Malay hands, whilst they murmur the *Ave Maria* to the Queen of Heaven. They are now a civilized, Christianized people, living in peace and harmony with their neighbors and worshipping in simple-hearted sincerity in the little church which is the center of their lives. All this Bishop Brent saw and approved. But once again the war upset things Anglican. Bishop Brent was transferred to be Chaplain of the American Expeditionary Forces, and since his return from that duty has been made bishop in Buffalo, New York. "A king who knew not Joseph", Bishop Graves of Shanghai, has been placed in temporary charge of the work in the Philippines and his first official act was to order the discontinuance of the practices which Sagada has held most dear, emphasizing his disapproval of them by refusing,

at a recent visitation, to enter the church for the ceremony of blessing the people, an invariable custom of Bishop Brent on his arrival in the village and one to which the people looked forward with great pleasure. Moreover he has written to the Board of Missions, which controls the actions of missionaries, demanding the withdrawal of Father Staunton and his associate there. The matter rested in this uncomfortable position until the meeting of the recent General Convention. But in the meantime "What does *Ecclesia Anglicana* stand for?"

How many there are that have asked themselves that question! It is the eternal one with the Catholic-minded in Anglicanism. They see their Church flirting with heresy, coquetting with Protestant sects in "open pulpit" canons, "concordats" and what not. They see practical Unitarianism raising its voice with scarcely a protest from those in high places. But they do not see what they so earnestly try to make themselves believe that they see, the setting forth of Catholic doctrine as the official teaching of their Church. How many a high-churchman has died broken-hearted over it. True martyrs to conscience these men have been, but blind to the only path which leads to truth and peace. Others of us have found that path, walking the footsteps of Newman, Faber, St. John, Manning, Ward and all that group of intrepid Oxonians who bravely followed the "kindly light," distant and dim though it sometimes seemed to be. Thousands in the years that have passed since their day have been confronted with the same question and have come to the same conclusion.

The Anglican Churches have no definite standard of doctrine or practice, things that in one diocese or parish are held as articles of the Faith are in the next one anathematized as "fond things vainly imagined" and as the inventions of the devil. To ask what does it stand for, is to ask an impossibility in the way of an answer. It has "no special theory attached" to any teaching. It tolerates almost everything, but let him beware who sees in Rome any security. For this it does not stand. One by one the Catholic-minded see the hopelessness of trying to be Catholics without Catholic authority, and through deep travail they tread the path, making their individual submissions. It is the gradual dawning of truth which makes "corporate reunion" a dream instead of a probability. The Bishop of Zanzibar raises the question, the Bishop of Delaware and others have given its answer. Happy is "he that hath ears to hear" and a heart of sufficient courage to accept the "still small voice" and all the trials to which he is subjected who listens to it. It is a gift from God, for "flesh and blood hath not revealed it" but the Father has sent His Spirit and had led them "into all truth". Let Catholics pray for such, that "their strength fail not" and for the others that the light of faith may dawn upon them and that they may warm themselves in the bright effulgence of the Sun of Justice.

In Quest of Jesuitism

J. B. CULEMANS

HERE is no telling what a globe-trotter, familiar with the harbors of the seven seas, may discover and commit to print. This is especially true when the American in search of business or adventure, takes ship for our southern hemisphere and reports the results of his wanderings. Sometimes, when a special class of readers is appealed to, these are gulled beyond measure with hyperbolic tales of priestcraft. The findings of the Panama Congress on Christian Work in Latin America will long stand out as a conspicuous example of this sort of literature. Biased feeling is allowed to run riot and prejudice is given free rein: the outcome is exactly what this particular portion of the public wanted, and its tastes are amply gratified.

When the traveler is not a special pleader in the cause of the mission board that pays him for seeing with a warped vision, he generally tries to show a certain breadth of view by seasoning his strictures with a dash of praise, as he rehearses the old topics of the Inquisition, the Jesuits and the endless iniquities of Catholic Spain and Portugal in the New World. By not condemning outright what those Catholic pioneers did and taught in southern lands, he gives an impression of liberal mindedness all the more likely to deceive the unwary. Usually, when examined in the light of history, the result of his efforts gives proof of nothing more than inexcusable ignorance and contracted mentality.

Clayton Sedgwick Cooper, in his recent volume of "The Brazilians and Their Country", has admirably succeeded in this interesting quest for the Jesuitical bugaboo, which of course impersonates the whole Catholic Church. And with sharp strokes he limns its unlovely features:

North American religion, inherited from the Pilgrim Fathers, has shown signs at times of inquisitorial tendencies, and, like the Catholic faith of Europe, three centuries ago, it has frequently revealed in its sponsors a stubborn narrowness and a loveless aspect far removed from the Great Founder's life and teachings, which both faiths have claimed to incorporate; yet nothing in the darkest annals of witch and heresy hunting of American Protestantism can compare as a religious heritage with the blinding bigotry and the grasping commercialism which Latin America inherited from the Catholicism of the Middle Ages. The new world priest in Brazil and her sister colonies was not an unmixed blessing, to say the least, and the Jesuit, Carmelite, Franciscan and Dominican religious houses, which exerted for a time certain civilizing influences in the country, grew so rich, autocratic and despotic that they were driven from the land on a wave of great popular indignation. In their train has come a long straggling line of half-trained native priests, who, according to the opinion of many Brazilians, have combined, in country districts especially, the relics of a medieval mysticism with the superstitions fostered by the negro nurse and an ignorant clergy.

How the grasping commercialism of those early days of discovery is in any way different from that modern commercialism, pitiless and successful, which the author

glorifies further on in his book, and in which he describes the future salvation of Brazil, is hard to see, unless it be for the reason that the former was sponsored by Catholics and therefore is doubly tainted. But that is neither here nor there. For this open-eyed traveler is generous enough to acknowledge that

It was Brazil's fortune to get some ideas of humanitarianism and schooled civilization from the Jesuits, than whom probably no more astute, intelligent, though politically-minded, clerics ever existed.....Brazil had at least some men in these trying, colonizing days, like Father Nobrega, a Jesuit contemporary of St. Francis Xavier, and his rival and follower in disinterested exertions for his fellows, while the priest-adventurers, following in Pizarro's train held a fiery cross over the land of the Incas, scathing and consuming as were the blood-stained swords of the Spanish chieftains.

How and why those Jesuit benefactors of the country grew "autocratic and despotic and should be driven from the land on a wave of great popular indignation", the writer fails to explain, just as he fails to explain an altogether contradictory statement of his own further on: "By these (Jesuit) missionaries the Indians were held in a state of pupillage and it is believed that in many cases their control of their converts resembled a condition of slavery". He himself admits, however, that slavery continued to exist long after the Jesuits were expelled from the country.

With the same airy superficiality he makes his own the statement of an unnamed historian of Brazil that, before the decree of banishment "the monks swarmed in every street, and were at once sluggards and libertines". A new light has since dawned on the forsaken land, and the few Protestant schools, the torch-bearers of progress, like Mackenzie College, receive unstinted praise, while Catholic schools, dotting the country, are mentioned only with a passing slur.

The education of girls is backward as in most South American countries. Co-education is not general. The Catholic seminary and fitting school is lacking in thoroughness, inclined to give the young ladies a dilettante smattering of polite studies; and the curriculum, while strong in doctrinal religion, is weak in modern scientific studies.

For all that he is obliged to acknowledge that

Brazilian women are not only nice to look at and intelligent conversationalists; they are furthermore "the mothers of men". It is a land of large families, eight or ten children being no exception in the Brazilian home. The upbringing of children is not attended with any superfluous modern fads, and eugenics, twilight sleep, birth control, together with other reforms of our northern "efficiency" civilization, are as yet unknown. It may be only a matter of time when Brazil, like the United States, will begin to copy Germany in this machine-made existence, and a race of non-domestic females, simply devoted to some "cause", will be joining a lot of non-domestic men who had rather go reforming than make homes, and the old land of the Pedros will ring with suffragette speeches and sterilized drinking cups.

One wonders whether after all Jesuitism is not to a large extent responsible for the further fact approvingly quoted from personal observation in Brazilian homes that "there are probably no women more virtuous or faithful to their marriage vows in any nation than the

women of Brazil". And again, "family life in Brazil offers wide opportunities for discussion with relatives and friends, claiming the majority of the masculine element after business is over", thus doing away with the North American's inordinate predilection for clubs to spend his every evening away from the family circle. This love of home life also supplies the reason why

Brazilian children are usually well-behaved, revealing a veneration for older people and a restraint of buoyancy which are far too uncommon in the United States. And this reverential attitude is maintained all through life: the boy kisses his father's hand as he enters the room, and this custom of sons is continued through life, the father of a grown-up family never omitting to bend his head over his aged father's or mother's hand at meeting, as respectfully as does his boy above his own.

It is hardly admissible that this splendid family spirit could be kept alive without the fostering influence of religion, and one is inclined to doubt the author's statement: "Teachers affirm that at least ninety per cent of the students in state schools are non-religious and that the other ten per cent are nominally Catholic". It recalls all too plainly a similar statement made at the Panama congress. The wish has possibly been father to the thought, in order to justify a frantic evangelical propaganda for the purpose of "Christianizing" the country. And an intellectual opaqueness not even surpassed at Panama has mothered this further declaration:

The Brazilians are inclined to hold the opinion that might well become general everywhere, that a religion which prevents a man from defending his country in need, or shields criminals against society through a confessional or any other ecclesiastical device, ought to be given up or exchanged for a belief more in harmony with common sense and national patriotism.

It is passing strange that a man bent on Church and Jesuit baiting will exhibit a lack of knowledge that evokes a pitying smile:

The Jesuits evidently did more for the Indians of Brazil (until their own lust for rule and gold proved their undoing) than did the early Spanish missionary priests in Ecuador and Peru, where pious religious ceremonials at the killings of Inca chieftains were hardly intended to impress the natives with the benevolence of either their conquerors or their faith.

There is no historical record anywhere of "pious religious ceremonials at the killings of Inca chieftains". The worst indictment Prescott could frame against Father Valverde was that he tried, but in vain, to convert to Christianity the Inca Atahualpa before his execution by the Spaniards.

Newman once remarked that error is like other delinquents: give it rope enough and it will be found to have a strong suicidal propensity. And he adds that it is well at times to take our part in encouraging and helping forward the prospective suicide not only by giving error rope enough, but by showing it how to handle and adjust the rope, by committing the matter to reason, reflection, sober judgment, common sense, to time, the great interpreter of so many secrets. It would often seem that little is gained by presenting facts as they are to minds molded in a deformed historical cast. But as the puritan scales fall from their eyes, North American

travelers under the Southern Cross may in the course of years gain a truer perspective of the great drama that was played there in centuries past, by men with the souls of heroes and Saints, beside whom the modern engineer with his wonderful accomplishments is but a pigmy.

Then they will learn, to their own surprise that Jesuitism, as defined by the Standard Dictionary: "deceptive practices, subtle distinctions or political duplicity, craft", is a myth, a relic of the dark ages of binding bigotry consequent upon the Reformation.

A Lesson from Race Riots

HENRY E. O'KEEFFE, C. S. P.

THE recent Negro race riots are but exploitations of a disorganized or perhaps organized discontent.

They are the pathetic and abortive struggle of an inferior race to give birth to itself, in the face of an intolerant expression of American civilization. When Alice Meynell was in our country, on a trip to California, she passed, on her way, some Indian reservations. The tragedy of a dying race was shadowed in high cheek bones and the placid melancholy of the Indian women and children. That this gentle English lady so taciturn in her method should have spoken to me concerning it was but an evidence that she had already intimately divined the historic horror of a decadent and majestic race. The Negro less romantic and picturesque in historic aspect than the Indian is nevertheless more stirring in his pitifulness. He too must die, if there be any veracity in ethnological assertion. Not that he is not prolific, but confine him in civilized habitations and alleys of our Southern cities and he becomes keenly susceptible to decline. If he is not like the red man, a dweller in tents, he is, at least, out of joint with the strictures of a Caucasian civilization. Herein lurks the difficult core of the Negro problem. Because of this it is not understood in England, and only partially in the South and still less in our northern States.

Yet, withal, is this an apology for our apathy economic and religious? Is it radically true that we must first civilize and then Christianize? Is it possible that one quality should be the salutary complement of the other?

Doubtless the Roman slaves brought from Africa and the outer confines of the Empire, seemed to be higher types than even the Negro of the West Indies. Therefore they were more alive to the delicate sense of Christianity. But the Josephites of Mill Hill, England are now struggling to gain ground, in the Uganda, Madras, Borneo, Labuan, Kashmir, and the basin of the Congo, that they may convert types of Negroes much more obtuse than ours.

Herbert Cardinal Vaughan visited these United States in 1863 and again in 1872. The Negro problem was so acute to this English prelate that he sent to Baltimore the first four missionaries for the American Negroes. These young priests were Americans and the first fruits of his foundation at Mill Hill. Their departure from England was marked by a special ceremony of farewell and a sermon by Archbishop, afterwards, Cardinal Manning.

It was in 1896 when I met Cardinal Vaughan and he referred to this event with a sense of humble trust that the Divine Will would complete the simple beginnings of his work in the American republic. His work or his dream, which let us pray, was not all a dream, may be put in these hopeful words. He would have his missionaries to the Negro overrun the South. He seemed to believe that under the spell of American zeal this would be but a natural development. But his golden hopes loomed still brighter. Might not, thought he, the American republic prove to be the half-way house to Africa? Might not the American Negro priests, eventually prove to be the most effective missionaries for the conversion of the Dark Continent itself?

The magnificence of the Cardinal's hopes are obvious, but what is more to be noted, is, that he, at least, believed the Negro to be capable of the finest Christianity, as manifested in its heroic missionary form. Whether it be the optimism of the prophet which beholds things as they are to be or the enhanced imagination of a profoundly religious man, it does not, for the moment, matter. The faintest expression of his high hope should fill us Americans with confusion and shame when we measure with what indifference we are dealing with the Negro.

Southerners are not to be blamed for the problem which was abruptly thrust upon them by the North. Still less are the struggling Southern Bishops and priests culpable, since they are few and poor and possessing only the interior resources of good men. The affluence and power are in the Northern States. The missionaries and the money should come from the North, at least, from wherever there is an excess in numbers of shepherds of souls.

Is it not startling and to our dishonor that the American Bishops conscious of their inability to cope with a problem at their doors, made a special appeal to Europe to come to the rescue and send us priests ready to devote themselves entirely to the colored population? This was at the Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866. Mr. J. G. Snead-Cox, the biographer of the English Cardinal, says that it was "in answer to that prayer that Herbert Vaughan had come." He studied the Negro problem on the spot. He made a tour of the Southern States and he saw sights which filled him with sorrow and compassion. For ignorance and spiritual desolation he was prepared, but it came as a shock to find how little was being done for the Negro and how far he seemed outside the area

of religious and philanthropic effort. He had heard all this, had been warned of it before he left England and by none more emphatically than by the representatives of the Catholic Church in the United States.

This unhappy, sociological and religious condition of the American Negro has been bettered only in a slight degree. It is no longer a Southern problem, for such cities in the West as Chicago are seething with Negroes and our own metropolitan city harbors thousands of them who know not even the name of Christ.

However, if conditions have been softened in the South, and it is likewise a problem for the North, it may be of service in stimulating our zeal to record some of the circumstances entered in the diary of Cardinal Vaughan in 1872. Have they an counterpart in this year of 1919, to provoke interest for the Negro both in the North and South? At least, no harm can be done now, and no sensibilities violated, if we quote a few entries, taken from the little commonplace book he kept at that time:

A common complaint that white and black children are not allowed to make their First Communion on the same day.

A colored soldier refused Communion by a priest at the Cathedral. Delassize's inclination to shoot the priest.

In a church just built here, benches let to colored people which are quite low down.

A lady, colored, built nearly half the church, another gave the altar; both refused places except at the end of the church.

A fancy fair: colored people allowed to work for it but not admitted to it.

I visited the hospital where there were a number of negroes. Talked to many in it and in the street. All said they had no religion. Never baptised. All said either they would like to be Catholics or something to show they were not opposed to it. Neither the priest with me nor the Sisters in the hospital do anything to instruct them. They just smile at them as though they had no souls. A horrible state of feeling. How is it possible so to treat God's image?

St. Louis, January 25, 1872—The Archbishop thought all my plans would fail; could suggest nothing for the negroes, and refused permission to collect, and declined to give a letter of approval.

A few lines further down in the diary he adds:

Father Callaghan, S. J., who has for seven years worked for the negroes, disagrees with the Archbishop on this question. Speaks of the virtue and simplicity of the negro.

In Memphis he notes:

Negroes regarded even by priests as so many dogs. One old man, who on being shown a crucifix and told it represented the death of Jesus Christ, looked at it steadily, and then said slowly: "How wicked of those Yankees to treat that poor Southern General like that."

It is to be noted that Father Vaughan, as he prolongs his stay, grows more and more satisfied of the practical wisdom of separating the two races even in Church. In Charleston he writes:

Father Folchi, the priest of the colored people, says: "There may be two thousand nominally Catholic negroes in Charleston; about three hundred attend his little church." But he has admitted the whites, and this, the Bishop says, has ruined his chance of success with the blacks. He has a school in which there are about fifty children. Father Folchi very anxious for us to come and help him—so also the Bishop.

Father Mandini, of St. Stephen's Church, has got up a little Chapel for colored people, which they highly appreciate. He says they like to have a place of their own without its being determined that no white shall enter. This is the common opinion of intelligent people and I think true.

Father Vaughan visited Mobile, Savannah, Vicksburg, Natchez, Memphis, Charleston, St. Louis and New Orleans. He then came north to New York, and went from there through the eastern States, lecturing and preaching on the subject which had now taken captive his heart and soul. A curious picture indeed of some thirty or forty years ago, a young priest from England struggling to teach the Catholics of America their responsibilities toward a race which was, and is now, almost in absolute ignorance of even the elements of Christianity. His enthusiasm may have led him to overlook the real difficulties of the problem and to exaggerate the intelligence and natural virtues of the negro, but one cannot but love and admire him for it. The aggressive zeal, coming, too, from a stranger, may explain why he received a somewhat mixed reception from the local clergy. We can imagine that he must have lost patience with those who worked unceasingly among the whites, but regarded the blacks as hopeless or at least outside of their field of labor. It was characteristic of the man that he should seek an interview with the ex-President of the Confederate States. His opinions are given in the diary thus:

Called on Jefferson Davis. He said the negro, like a vine, could not stand alone. No gratitude, but love of persons—no patriotism, but love of place instead. He says that men are warring against God in freeing the negro; that he is made to be dependent and servile; that in Africa wherever a community does well an Arab is to be found at the head of it. I urged that this was a reason in favor of our mission, that no one but the Catholic Church could supply the guidance and support the negroes need. Mr. Davis quite agreed with this. "The field is not promising," he said, "but you have the best chance. The Methodists and Baptists do much mischief among them; their religion is purely emotional."

Certainly this opinion of Jefferson Davis in reference to the emotional appeals of the Methodists to the negroes, is very interesting, but Father Vaughan's comment concerning it is more interesting and touched with practical suggestion. In one place in the diary he exclaims: "Why cannot we have catechists or brothers like the Methodist preachers?"

Then in several places we find him suggesting the necessity of what we call "popular devotions", which he regards as essential for success among the Negroes.

Finally we are constrained to say that this man, a stranger in our country, studied the nature of the Negro problem with intelligence and by personal investigation. Although of a buoyant temper, he was not highly emotional, but a bluff, hard-headed, practical Englishman, therefore his roseate hopes are, at least, worthy of attention. They are summed up in the following eloquent passage, describing his prophetic vision of the American Negroes proving to be the willing means of evangelizing Africa itself:

We have come to gather an army on our way, to conquer it for the Cross. God has his designs upon that vast land. It may be 1000 years behind our civilization of today, but what were our forefathers a little more than 1000 years back compared to our present condition? They were sunk in an apparently hopeless barbarism. But God sent missionaries to them from a Christian nation, and they brought them into the light. Nation is dependent on nation, and we have to carry on the light. In less than 1000 years Africa may be as civilized as Europe or America. The mission of the English-speaking races is to the unconverted, especially to the uncivilized, nations of the world. God calls upon you for cooperation: His plans are prepared from afar. The branch torn away from the parent stem in Africa by our ancestors was carried to America, carried away by Divine permission, in order that it might be engrafted upon the Tree of the Cross. It will return, in part, to its own soil, not by violence or deportation, but willingly and borne upon the wings of faith and charity.

May it be that the vision was really prophetic and that the Negro will yet come to the Cross in holy faith and simplicity.

One Medal Short

JOHN HEARLEY

THE President would visit the Pope: the Roman journals published the news, generally without comment. The Clericals were happy and laughed rather loudly "up their sleeves" at the anti-Clericals. The anti-Papal literature, which had poured into the American embassy at Rome, had proved futile.

In the President's prospective action, the Clericals saw a political and psychological victory for the Holy See. The anti-Clericals shouted *non importa*, but at bottom were gravely concerned. The Italian masses were largely indifferent or dumb. They seemed interested much in the man, their momentary *alter Christus* and little in his comings and his goings. They asked him and expected him to visit them only and suffered pathetic disappointment and their first disillusion, when he did not do so.

It was insisted by the anti-Clericals that the President's approaching audience with the Pope had no bearing—"direct or indirect"—upon the Roman question. The Clericals quickly retorted: "*Che vergogna!* His refusal or failure to visit the Holy Father would be regarded as a triumph for the Quirinal!"

The Cabinet, after sensing the entire situation, was just as indifferent as the masses, or pretended to be. In public the official attitude was that Mr. Wilson, although a guest of the King and Government, was, nevertheless, a "free agent."

Meanwhile, his Holiness quietly made plans for the President's presentation. Thinking that Mrs. Wilson might also be in the audience, the Pope gave orders for the preparation of two gifts. One intended for Mrs. Wilson was to be a valuable mosaic of St. Peter, made in the Vatican studios. The other, for the President, was to be a costly and rarely beautiful peace medal. The medal would be of solid gold and of exquisite workmanship. On one side there would be carved the figure of the Redeemer, the Prince of Peace, and certain suggestive symbols. On the reverse side there would be an inscription in honor of President Wilson and of his success in bringing peace to the world.

December days were declining, as the medal slowly neared completion. Expert craftsmen and artistic delicately shaped and carved the heavy piece of glistening gold. The moment for polishing the metal came. It was placed in an appropriate machine. The mechanical operation started. Almost immediately, there was a sharp sound. The still unfinished Medal had cracked in two.

The time was late. The President and the Pope would meet in a day or two. It was impossible, quite impossible to pre-

pare a new Medal and the broken one was beyond repair. What could be done!

The Fourth Wise Man never reached the Manger. He lost the path of the Star.

Mrs. Wilson did not see the Pope: Mr. Wilson did. As a souvenir of the occasion, the President carried away a lovely mosaic of St. Peter.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six hundred words.

Help the Sisters

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have just returned from three months in Germany, under appointment from the Society of Friends, where I came in touch with many groups in that sadly suffering country. In Southern Germany, as your readers will understand, the population is largely Catholic, and I have met some of the splendid Sisters who are giving their lives for the physical and spiritual help of the innocent children there. In co-operation with the English Society of Friends, we have given out nearly \$500,000 in relief and we have been glad to give thousands of pounds of food to these Sisters for their little charges. In so doing I have come to realize the great need of the Sisters themselves.

After four years of desperate warfare, Germany has used up her whole stock of food and clothes. The whole population is in want. Every effort is made to find substitutes, but this is very difficult to do in the matter of the habits of the Sisters. It is, of course, an expression of the religious spirit of their lives that they should use fine black serge for their habits. Now their clothes are worn out and their reserve supplies entirely exhausted. I have realized how much they will suffer this winter both in body and mind if they cannot have the proper habits of their Orders. The children, too, will suffer in both body and mind without their ministrations. Cannot the Catholics of America give a helping hand in this need? The materials can be forwarded from London. Too much money cannot be given to the Sisters and their work. The need seems infinite.

Mount Kisco, N. Y.

CAROLINA M. WOOD.

Hadrian's Bull

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In a letter published in AMERICA for October 4 by R. St. I., under the caption, "Hadrian's Bull," I was much interested to note the following quotation from the late Cardinal Moran:

Besides what has been noted elsewhere in relation to this spurious Bull (of Hadrian IV), it should be stated, in the light of exhaustive researches, recently made in the Vatican library, that the document adduced as a Papal Bull to Henry II, was only a plausibly drafted transcript, with much adroitly and invidiously changed phraseology, of a genuine letter of the Pope to King Louis VII of France. . . . Furthermore the pretended Bull to Henry, which was doubtless constructed by the notorious John of Salisbury, very cautiously bears no date, mentions no name of prince, but very incautiously for a skilled forger, it gives the name of the country in full, which was not the custom in such papal documents.

The writer then goes on to say that the readers of AMERICA may be left to draw their own conclusions from the above quotation, thereby implying a swift and unquestionable condemnation of the Papal Bull.

In this connection, I may say that, despite the declarations of so great and revered an authority as the late Cardinal, it cannot be unconditionally asserted that the Bull, "*Laudabiliter*," is a spurious document. The presence of such authorities in favor of the Bull as Newman, Hergenroether, Mann, Thurston, Malone and D'Alton would seem to justify me in registering a modest doubt against the sweeping inference implied by Mr. Waage's adversary.

Moreover, so far is this question from being settled in the way in which the correspondent desires, that the greater amount of evidence and the majority of authorities will be found upholding the disputed paper. If it is made a question of the reliability of the testimony of Giraldus Cambrensis, as many maintain, there is a ready answer in the fact that the Bull is not only found three times in the works of that historian, but it is also found independently in other sources. It is found in Ralph de Diceto's "Imagines Historiarum", which was compiled before 1199 and seems to be altogether independent of the other author. Moreover, Roger of Wendover also gives the Bull independently of Giraldus, and Cardinal Baronius discovered another independent copy.

The charge of irregularity is made against the structure of the Bull. In answer I may say that the defects mentioned have a plausible explanation for their existence, and, furthermore, the objection itself is wholly outweighed by the mass of circumstances tending to prove that the disputed letter is genuine. The absence of date and name in the letter is hardly fatal. These are defects which a public document might suffer from in our own times, and one can readily believe in the occurrence of such an error in the twelfth century, when State papers felt the absence of modern efficiency. The objection stands on technicalities. These dwindle into slight significance in comparison with the circumstantial evidence pointing to the existence of Hadrian's document. Political conditions in the twelfth century furnish a plausible argument to sustain our belief. The distraught state of Ireland, the fact that the Papal throne was occupied by an Englishman and a zealous partizan of peace, the shrewd cunning and hypocrisy of Henry, all form a fertile soil for the growth of just such an evil. Again, it is of no little importance that the Bull was confirmed by succeeding Popes. Were their decrees also forgeries? It is strange, too, that the Bull was not challenged for centuries by those whose interests were seriously endangered by English rule in Ireland, and who could scarcely have been ignorant of the case in question. These and other facts connected with the transactions of Hadrian and Henry II are so strongly in favor of the existence of such a document as Hadrian's Bull that it seems to me to be a lost hope to bring up a squadron of helpless technicalities.

Mr. Waage, in his position with regard to the genuineness of the Bull "*Laudabiliter*", seems to maintain by far the more probable view. Exception, however, may be taken to an impression which the latter conveyed, perhaps inadvertently, in his article entitled, "The President's Sense of Delicacy." While holding that the grant of Hadrian would be of no value in our day, Mr. Waage seems to admit that Ireland, by the action of Hadrian, became immediately a part of English territory. This, however, cannot be admitted without serious damage to Ireland's cause. Once it is admitted that the Saxon has ever held legal title over the Emerald Isle, then good-bye to our hopes and aspirations. Our greatest weapon is our right to the land. We shall never admit that England gained the title. In this particular case it cannot be shown that Ireland fell into the possession of England. The Bull, "*Laudabiliter*," permitted Henry to land in Ireland for the sake of restoring order; the land once subjected to the Kingdom of Christ was to be thereafter guarded by the Church; it was the property of the See of St. Peter, as the king himself later admitted. This is the view of Hergenroether, who says clearly, that, "No mention was made of a temporal right or real donation." And this was undoubtedly the view held by the Irish chieftains who lived at the time. The chieftains resisted the domination of the English for four centuries after the arrival of Henry on the Irish coast.

It is with reluctance equal to that of R. St. I. that I venture upon this criticism of an article written in behalf of Ireland. It is well, however, to know where we really stand and to act accordingly. Mr. Waage's statement of Ireland's case

for self-determination was masterly and convincing. From such sources the Irish cause derives new hopes and new adherents. Let us hope that others, too, will take up the work.

Woodstock, Md.

P. J. HIGGINS.

League Leaflets

To the Editor of AMERICA:

On account of the strike which is still maintained by the printers' pressmen in New York City, it will not be possible for the "League Leaflets" and the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart* for December, published by the Apostleship of Prayer, to reach the centers for the usual promoters' meetings. Hence, I solicit the favor of your co-operation in informing priests and promoters of this impossibility. Will you please announce in your columns that the intention of the League of the Sacred Heart for December will be: "The Conversion of Unbelievers." The leaflets will be sent out from our New York office at the earliest possible moment.

New York.

JOHN CORBETT, S. J.

Hebrew and Japanese Resemblances

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The article on "Hebrew and Japanese Resemblances," by E. Winslow Gilliam in your issue of August 30, proved of special interest to me, in as far as the idea that the lost tribes of Israel have had some racial influence on the Japanese population has frequently suggested itself to me during eight years of residence in this country.

Mr. Gilliam's arguments, especially concerning the ceremonial purifications of the Shinto religion, are very interesting, but not quite convincing. If these ceremonies were to be attributed to Jewish influence there ought to be other traces of the same tradition, more particularly of the monotheism on which the Israelites laid such insistence. To my mind the clearest proof that some, but probably very little Jewish infiltration has taken place in ancient times, is the fact that distinctively Hebrew features are not rare in Japan. Although the prevailing Japanese type is evidently a mixture of the Malay from the South Sea Islands and the Mongolian from the Asiatic continent, it is not unusual to notice, especially among the higher classes, persons whose nose and lips are unmistakably Jewish. This Jewish element, however, could have had no influence on Japanese religious thought. Shinto is very primitive nature-worship; the architecture of the Shinto shrines, always built according to ancient tradition, is distinctly of Malay origin.

Mr. Gilliam's argument from Japanese names is to my mind wide of the mark. The frequent Japanese terminations in *i* (pronounced *ee*) no more suggest Hebrew connections than the fact that so many Irishmen are called Kelly, Kennedy, Duffy, etc., would make them out to be Israelites. The Japanese language, in its roots, formation of tenses, syntax, etc., is as far removed from Hebrew as it possibly could be. The figurative and poetical language of the Old Testament is unintelligible to the Japanese. The Japanese family names suggest anything rather than resemblance to Hebrew. As far as I remember, Hebrew names express some moral or religious sentiment, e. g., God is my King; the King is just, etc., whereas Japanese names are mostly names of places. Fukuzawa (not Fukuzama, as Mr. Gilliam has it) means luck swamp, Yokohama is the crosswise shore; Ishibashi (not Ishiboshi), means stone bridge, indicating surely no kindred with Ishbosheth, son of Saul. Some argument might be derived from the ancient *given* names like *Chōkichi* (permanent fortune), etc., but the thread would be altogether too slender for supporting so heavy a theory.

I regret, therefore, that I cannot fully agree with Mr. Gilliam's conclusions. There may have been some scattered remnants of the Ten Tribes that reached Japan in its pre-historic times, but assuredly their influence on the racial character and traditions has been practically nothing.

Tokyo, Japan.

VICTOR F. GETTELMAN, S. J.,

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1919

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSLEIN;
Treasurer, CHARLES J. DEANE

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID;
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The publication of this issue of AMERICA has been delayed by the strikes of the New York printers. The date and serial number are in compliance with the United States postal regulations.

Our Royal Critic

WHEN a prince speaks, he opens his mouth as Sir Oracle, at least when the zephyrs of his native, or adopted, land wait expectantly upon his utterance. In the absence of these favoring circumstances, he is liable, as the *incunabula* "Joe Miller" has it, "every time he opens his mouth, to put his foot in it." It would therefore seem a counsel, if not a command, of wisdom for a Prince on his travels, to see as much and to say as little as he can.

The young Prince of the House converted from Hanover to Windsor by the trend of events which began in 1914, was sparing in his speech in this country until he reached Washington. There he unfortunately gave out a written "greeting to the American people" which, however kindly in intent, is the undoubted work of some underling, imbued with the persuasion that even at Washington one must do as they do in London. "Your institutions," wrote this strabismic secretary, "your ways of life, your aims, are as democratic as ours."

We, no doubt, have our faults, but none so deep, so deplorable, as to bring across our backs the lash of this comparison. "Aims" in Persia, India, Egypt, Ireland, "aims" on the high seas open to all nations, "aims" of an American propaganda, at once flash across our troubled memory, and in vain do we search our national consciousness, seeking some faint justification of the secretary's parallel. Possibly, however, the secretary and the Prince of the House of Hanover-Windsor, were merely "gittin' orf a goak" as Artemus Ward did, when he asked the bodyguard of an earlier Prince of Wales to permit him to add to his collection of "Beests and Snaiks" the celebrated British Lion. Unhappily, Artemus who alone could justly chronicle the passage through this land of young Prince Edward, is no longer with us. Yet a

word of advice, culled from the works of that immortal may not be amiss. "When you git to be King, try and be as good a man as yure mother was. Be just & be Jenerus," especially to all captive peoples that, after this war waged on behalf of small nations everywhere, groan under the heavy yoke of the House of Hanover-Windsor.

Senator Williams and Mrs. Crupp

MRS. CRUPP, as is well known, was occasionally seized with "spazzums in the buzzum", and these paroxysms seemed not wholly unconnected with the lowering of the level in David Copperfield's brandy-bottles. Apparently, the senior senator from Mississippi is somewhat similarly afflicted, except that the "spazzums" are in his wits. This change of localization forbids the ascription of a similar cause, especially since the senator is no mother, as Mrs. Crupp was, nor is he a housekeeper. But afflicted he is, and scarcely yet recovered from the effects of one "spazzum," he fell into another on November 10, when arising from his place in the Senate, this peripatetic statesman undertook to tutor the junior Senator from Massachusetts in the elements of true Americanism. "Every man," proclaimed this remarkable person, "who claims the rights of American citizenship and the benefits of it, must throw behind him without 'mental reservation,' without Jesuitical pretense of any description, all of his European derivation."

The wrath of Senator Williams had been aroused by the opposition of Senator Walsh to the League of Nations, and particularly by a remark of the Massachusetts Senator to the effect that he was "an offspring from people of a subject race." Because of the "spazzum," the wits of Senator Williams interpreted this statement of fact, as a statement that Senator Walsh was acting, not as an American, but as an Irishman. Senator Walsh's reply, for obvious reasons, was not directed to Senator Williams. It was addressed to the American people, and will be received by them as a noble embodiment of that true Americanism which, most unhappily, has but a sparse growth in Mississippi, the home of lynchers and a black subject race. "I do not wonder," remarked Senator Lodge, "that the Senator recoils at 'subject races.' He is familiar with a subject race; he lives among them." Senator Walsh's speech appears in the *Congressional Record* for November 10; a few paragraphs are here quoted.

I stand here as a descendant of subject races. If it pleases you better, sir, I will speak more plainly. I stand here as the son of an humble Irish immigrant mother and father. Is that un-American?.....I speak for no European races. The Irish-and-English question has no business in this Chamber, but the relation of the American Government to that question has some business in this Chamber; and when these people have believed—mistakenly, if you please—and have thought, honestly and sincerely, that this covenant of a league of nations meant the United States joining with their oppressor, in God's name what is there in American institutions that prevents them from having

the right of petition, the right of protest? Has the right of protest gone from America? Yes, according to some, it has. *"If you are of Irish ancestry, accept this covenant, or you are pro-Irish and un-American; if you are of Italian or Greek or Lithuanian ancestry, accept this covenant, for if you protest, you are pro-Italian, pro-Lithuanian, or pro-Greek, and un-American,"* and so on. That is the argument.....

Has it come to this that we no longer respect the differences of opinion of men on great public questions and on great issues? Has it come to this that a man must be charged with bias and prejudice, when he takes a position on a public question, simply because of his race, because of his creed, because of his political faith? What progress have we made in 140 years of free institutions, if that is to be the conclusion at which we have arrived?.....

I am the offspring of subject races, sir, and I am proud of it.....You attempt to put in my mouth the words that I am not an American. Cannot a man be of Irish birth; cannot a man be a descendant of subject races; cannot a man be of Hebrew or Protestant or Catholic faith, and be proud of it, and yet be an American? And cannot an American Senator who is a descendant of a subject race, call attention to the fact that this compact in its present form may be a dangerous change in the policy of America? *Do not misunderstand my position. I protest as an American citizen and as an American Senator* against America joining in any compact with European powers which may change the whole policy of the United States of America, in its attitude of sympathy with and of aid toward subject peoples. That is my position.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to say more. I make no reference to the birth, I make no boast, as the Senator from Mississippi might well make of his or of his family's allegiance, or want of allegiance, to this Government in the years that have passed. I come to this conclusion: I leave it to my associates on both sides of the Chamber, men who differ from me and men who agree with me, to judge of my service in this hour, and my service in future years, as to whether I am entitled to be known and called an American Senator.

Comment is needless; except, perhaps, to suggest, that the Senior Senator from Mississippi at once put himself under the care of those specialists, whom the Eighteenth Amendment, it is hoped, will soon render as extinct as the dodo.

Mr. Murphy's Philosophy

ALTHOUGH usually up to its neck in hot water, the tea-kettle, as a cheery philosopher has recorded, continues to sing. Mr. Charles F. Murphy of New York is in very hot water just now, according to a certain section of the press, but for all that he is purring as contentedly as any tea-kettle that ever graced a hob. Mr. Murphy, it may be necessary to explain, is an Indian; but not of the cigar-store variety which allows all sorts of persons to come up and hack at it with impunity. He is the leader of a famous band of New York aborigines known as the untterrified Tammany tribe of Manhattan. Consequently, Mr. Murphy is regarded by the "uplift" press of New York, and by many excellent persons who dwell west of Hohokus, New Jersey, as a citizen of an almost unique quality of undesirability. But he lives on a philosophy that is worthy of the highest of causes.

"Have you any comment to make on the elections?" Mr. Murphy was asked.

"They're over," replied Mr. Murphy.

"Have you any explanation of the defeat suffered by Tammany Hall?" was the next question.

"That's past," replied the Democratic leader.

"The elections are over, and the defeat is past". In these remarks of Mr. Murphy, there is a striking resemblance to a philosophy constantly inculcated by the ascetical writers of the Church. They know, these holy men, that weak human nature is subject to reverses; but they also know that there is no more fatal state for the soul than acquiescence in defeat. The pilgrim may slip and fall, but there is always hope that he will reach the end of his journey safely, if after every fall he will only pick himself up, and continue on his way. And how can the man who continually broods over past defeats find time to plan future victories? For once at least, Mr. Murphy has lectured well. It is hard to conquer any individual who finds nothing in past reverses but a stimulus to new zeal in the present. His is the spirit that makes heroes and Saints.

Turning It Upside Down

THE smoke of battle has not completely lifted, but at present Ohio, Kentucky, and New Jersey seem to have voted "wet". Not that this action makes any immediate difference. It comes too late for that. The question of secession of the supremacy of Federal Amendment and Federal legislation, was settled many years ago. The Eighteenth Amendment is here, and here to stay for some time. Probably never, but certainly not within the next decade, will it have any notable effect upon the rich. Whatever legislatures may enact, the man who can pay the price will always be able to obtain alcoholic liquor. Its effect on the poor will, of course, be immediate. With this constitutional delirium in full swing, the lips that once touched beer will never touch it again.

A good view of this Amendment may be obtained by turning it upside down. Suppose that instead of forbidding a man to drink a glass of beer, it ordered him to imbibe at least one glass of beer daily. The invasion of personal rights would at once be apparent. No one can claim that the moderate use of any alcoholic liquor is, in itself, evil. I therefore commit no intrinsically evil act, if I indulge in such use, nor can any statute change the moral character of this act. On the other hand, it has never been shown either that the American people are a race of drunkards for whom absolute prohibition is the only cure, or that the evils of the traffic are such as seriously to threaten the existence or welfare of the State. As an Amendment to the Federal Constitution, Federal Prohibition is, therefore worse than an anomaly. It is an unwarranted violation of the right of a citizen to use alcoholic liquors or not, as he chooses. It is a violent invasion of the police powers of the several States. It is a public avowal that the absolutely essential American principle of local self-government has failed.

Nor will the invasion stop here. That is as certain as our own existence. The next move will be against freedom of education and freedom of religious worship. The Smith-Towner bill for the establishment of an educational autocracy at Washington, is the first step. Nothing is clearer than that among the subjects reserved absolutely to States, under the Constitution, is the control of education. Infringement on religious liberty is a proximate advance, facilitated by the practical application of this Amendment. To invoke the First Amendment against this menace, is folly. Our lethargy has allowed the Prohibitionists to assert the principle that a majority, however tenuous, need have no respect whatever for the constitutional rights of a minority however numerous. As long as the Eighteenth Amendment is, *de facto*, part of the supreme law of the land, for the avoidance of greater evils it should be obeyed. But this obedience does not mean that we may not use every right and lawful means to strike it from the Constitution. Unless some redress is obtained either by a reversal of the Amendment, or by such judicial interpretation as will render it nugatory, the breach in the wall protecting our liberties, is open to every horde of fanatics who seek to give their insanities the form and sanction of Federal law. No American will quarrel over a glass of beer. But no man is worthy to be an American who does not resist the fraud and injustice which deprives him of the least of his rights.

The Correct Historical Perspective

THAT there are very few circumstances connected with the Spanish Armada which have not been misrepresented and distorted for sectarian and party purposes is the conclusion that the thoughtful reader of Father Hull's valuable little book on "The Spanish Armada" can scarcely escape reaching. In the course of his argumentation he shows that the most fertile source of the popular errors regarding the true character of the Elizabethan age is the inability of the average Protestant writer and reader to obtain the proper historical perspective for those turbulent times. In this connection the author well says:

The difficulty is, of course, for any modern mind to dissociate itself from present environment and project itself back four centuries, and begin to see and think things as men of that remote age saw and thought them.

Catholics, on account of their doctrinal and disciplinary continuity with the Middle Ages, possess in themselves the key for the interpretation of the past; whereas Protestants, as a rule, are so traditionally alienated from everything Catholic as well as anything medieval, that they cannot even approach towards interpreting the policies and actions of the medieval Popes in terms of medieval principles, conventions, habits or customs. Hence the utter hopelessness of trying to deal with those attacks on past Popes which periodically disfigure our secular papers—disfigure, I say, because even though the aggressor happens to have got hold of the true facts (which more often than otherwise he has not) the interpretation he puts on them is something so wanting in historical perspective that it would be enough to make those Popes aforesaid, and their contemporaries as a whole, turn in their graves in frightened

astonishment at seeing affairs, which to them had the familiarity of daily life, interpreted in a way which it would never have entered into the horizon of their minds to conceive.....

The fact is, no history can profitably be discussed on an absolute ethical basis. Always must the relative element come in, always, must be taken into account the prevailing standpoint, the prevailing principles, customs and usages, the prevailing psychology. For it is only then that the events and actions and policies of any age can be placed in their true perspective, as concrete human occurrences to be measured and judged in their whole environment, and by the whole mentality out of which they have sprung.....

If intrigue, conspiracy and rebellion have an ugly sound in themselves, it is remarkable how differently they are regarded according to the sympathy or otherwise which is felt for the cause under which they are enlisted. Protestants who read of the intrigues and tricks and deceptions of Mazzini and Cavour with admiration, because they were directed to putting Pius IX off his throne, will howl with execration when they read of sixteenth-century Popes encouraging the Catholics of England and the King of Spain in their plans of putting Elizabeth off the throne. Those who look with complacency on Elizabeth sending expeditions to aid the Protestant rebels against Spain in Holland will turn with indignation against Gregory XIII sending an embassy to help the Catholic rebels in Ireland against Elizabeth.

The mental attitude of most Protestants who discuss the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century, so accurately described in the foregoing paragraphs, is the very one they take, unfortunately, whenever questions come up regarding the Church's policy or position in ages long past. They seem hopelessly blind to the fact that the Catholicism of today, in all its essentials of belief, government and practice, is precisely the same as the Catholicism of the second, the fifth, the thirteenth or the sixteenth century. The average non-Catholic text-book of medieval history, for instance, adroitly teaches the unsophisticated boys and girls who study it, that the religion that universally prevailed in Europe, say, in the twelfth century, is now quite obsolete, is professed today by no nation of intelligence and education, is of interest only to history scholars, whereas the truth is that some 300,000,000 people, who are indeed the "salt of the earth," now believe the creed, keep the Commandments, and obey the Pope, just as their Catholic forefathers did in the twelfth century.

There is no doubt that the average non-Catholic's inability to place in their proper setting the policy and conduct of the Church in each of the centuries that have preceded our own is a great obstacle to his conversion. For the powerful Protestant tradition, so diligently fostered by pulpit, press and platform, these 300 years and more, has given those brought up outside the Church such an utterly false conception of historic Catholicism, that the wide diffusion of convincing books like Father Hull's account of "The Spanish Armada" will first be needed in order to correct the Protestant's historical perspective of Catholicism. "To be deep in history," says Cardinal Newman, "is to cease to be a Protestant." But nothing, surely, will better secure that highly desirable depth than the art of finding the right historical perspective when studying the Church's past ages.

Literature

ST. TERESA AS AUTHOR

FOREIGNERS who visit the United States are always asked what they think of the country as soon as they have landed on our shores. Most of them seem addicted to the habit of writing a book in answer to the question. And even after they have resided here for some time the experience continues. Americans have a somewhat naive curiosity to know what strangers think about them. Converts, like foreigners, have a somewhat similar story to tell. People born to the Faith display what to the convert seems an odd interest in the convert's opinions and impressions. I know that such has been my personal experience. And, like some of our foreign visitors, I felt obliged to embody at least a part of my answer in a book. But no book could tell all or even more than a small part of what I have to say upon this inexhaustible subject. However, within the brief limits of the present article I may only touch briefly upon a single theme. That theme shall be my amazement, my wonder, and my grief that my Catholic friends seem to pay such little attention to the great glories of their own Catholic literature. And when I say this I do not mean poorly educated Catholics, people who have had little or no opportunity to become acquainted with true literature. I mean, on the contrary, men and women who are, or, at least, who consider themselves well educated, well read, alert to the value of literature, conversant with its masterpieces, keenly interested in its developments—in a word, Catholics of culture. They are the ones in whom I have observed this strange ignorance of and indifference to some of the best of our Catholic literature. Take the case of St. Teresa, for an eminent example of what I mean. Even among some of those who are most addicted to Carmelite devotions, who wear the scapular, who crowd the Carmelite churches during the great novenas, who have a real appreciation of the Carmelite spirit, and the value of the contemplative life—even among these favored ones I have observed this same dullness of apprehension to St. Teresa's eminence as a writer.

I do not know any reason why piety should blunt or in any way be opposed to literary culture. Unquestionably, many of the greatest saints have been supreme poets, orators, prose-writers, stylists, composers, painters, sculptors, architects, artists great and true. Think of Augustine, St. John the Divine, St. Thomas Aquinas, Fra Angelico, John of the Cross, the two St. Catherines, Angela Foligno, Juliana of Norwich, Walter Hilton, and many, many, many other shining names on my calendar; while from those less well known and admired by Catholics what a glorious list might be compiled! But to return to St. Teresa: I repeat even among those who are keenly aware of Teresa's eminence in sanctity there are many who are obtuse or even blind to her eminence as a great mistress of the written word, as an author fit to rank, as her own Spain long ago did rank her, high among the classic prose-authors of the world; while among those to whom her sanctity does not particularly matter, save for the vague and lukewarm respect which so many of us pay to our saints—a vague and lifeless respect which we might pay as well to some fictitious hero or heroine in some book or other—her power and artistry as a writer seem utterly unknown.

What a pity! Those who do not know and appreciate Teresa's literary art miss a great joy, a joy that would truly bring a blessing in its wake. To be ignorant of the literary beauty and value of Teresa is particularly unfortunate because of the over-wide prevalence of a type of book which does not do our holy Faith much service: I mean the sentimental and badly written works of hagiography which somewhat profusely

abound—especially in translation. Sanctity is the thing that mostly matters in this world. This high theme is worthy of the most vivid, the most dramatic, the most powerful and impassioned of prose and poetry. And such is the treatment which it meets with at the hands of those who only are truly qualified to deal with it adequately, the Saints themselves. By this I do not mean to say that all others than saints should keep hands off this greatest of subjects, but I do mean to say that it should not be entrusted to weak and sentimental people, and when it does fall into such hands, our criticism should say so, and badly written books about our Saints should not be excused because of the good intentions or piety of their mistaken authors.

In the works of Teresa, sanctity is written about as nowhere else in literature. And I think this is so because never, even in her most transcendental flights, does she forget that sanctity is human: that it is a process of human life. Herself one of the greatest mystics of all time, one to whom the strangest and least-known regions of the spiritual world were known by actual right of discovery and exploration, she at the same time was the most practical of women: full of down-right common-sense, busy all her life with the matter-of-fact details of the complicated business of founding and supporting her convents, and spending many years in traveling on foot or mule-back over the mountains and plains of her dearly loved Spain. Her books and letters she wrote when other affairs permitted, and all her books were composed in obedience to the commands of her superiors. In short, they were starkly practical. They were not sentimental or "literary" vaporings. They were written for a purpose, as a task. And never once did Teresa strike an attitude or force a mood. She was honestly herself, and because she conquered herself she was God's instrument and her pen became an instrument of His Holy Spirit.

What a delicious and revealing incident is that episode of brother Juan de la Miseria and the portrait which he painted of our author. Brother Juan was a phenomenon which every Religious Order seems to produce, both before his time and since; I mean he had "a talent for art," or thought he had, or was supposed by others to have, and insisted upon displaying it. Now, in the case of such an one as Fra Angelico, everything is all right, and posterity has reason to be grateful. But, alas, not all these "talents for art" are of the Fra Angelico degree! And when poor St. Teresa gazed upon Brother Juan's production, she said: "May God forgive him for making me so ugly!" And the exclamation is priceless. In it we may read the woman in the saint, and all her books are nothing other than that—the marvelous exposition of the progress of a most human and passionate soul through all the dangers and difficulties of human life, upward to the peaks of an almost unexampled sanctity. And the language in which these splendid adventures are related is always the language of the comment on Brother Juan; just as unstudied, always natural, expressing the thoughts she was really thinking, and not the thoughts which she might have considered she *should* have been entertaining because she had a pen in her hand. Except for those irrevocably addicted to the bad and debilitating habit of only reading for idle amusement ("to pass the time," as such poor souls say), readers who seek for the entertainment and emotional pleasure which the best novels and autobiographies supply will find in St. Teresa's books a mine of golden treasure. Nor is this novelistic quality merely psychological. In many passages of the "Life," and in chapter after chapter of the "Book of the Foundations," a ~~one~~-volume edi-

tion of both works being published by the Paulist Fathers, you will find the best of literary fare, from a purely literary and not religious point of view. The Saint's wanderings throughout the country in founding her monasteries or visiting those already established furnish an inexhaustible theme of interest. The little sketches of the people she met or with whom she had dealings, from royal personages down to inn-keepers and muleteers, are etched with incisive strokes of an always kindly, but always keenly observant spirit. These, indeed, are books of the high romance of the human soul way-faring in this valley of tears, a valley, however, not all of tears, but of great joy and deep consolation when the secret of its quest is known as it was known to Teresa of Jesus. And withal the Spain of her own day and generation is described and preserved forever in these scintillating pages which relate the history of a soul. And this is the reason why, without even mentioning her marvelous poems, St. Teresa is hailed in Spain as a classic author, one who takes her place among such masters as Cervantes and Luis de Granada. But I wonder why she is so little known among Americans.

MICHAEL WILLIAMS.

REVIEWS

The Spanish Armada: History of England Series. By ERNEST R. HULL, S. J., Editor of the *Examiner*. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons. \$0.35.

A Bombay paper's remark last year that "The Spanish Armada was the Pope's attempt to establish his power by force of arms," gave Father Hull the occasion for writing the papers that he has now brought together in this admirable little book, a work which will make the Catholic readers, students and teachers of the Reformation period his grateful debtors. For the author shows that the Spanish Armada, was not a Papal crusade directed against heretical England, but merely a maneuver in the just war Philip II was waging against Elizabeth on account of the unprovoked attacks of her pirates on the Spanish-American trade and on account of the help she had been giving his rebellious subjects in the Netherlands. The reigning Pope, Sixtus V., was not at all as interested in the enterprise as the Protestant tradition makes him. He was "only a half-hearted and reluctant supporter of the scheme after it had been inaugurated by the king." Philip found a war forced upon him and like a shrewd sixteenth-century politician, he saw the advantage of making his projected attack upon England appear like a Catholic crusade.

Father Hull emphasizes again the importance of the historical students' grasping the mentality of the age they are discussing. Much of the anti-Catholic bitterness engendered by the very name "Spanish Armada" arises from the common error of judging the sixteenth century by the standards of the nineteenth. As for the alleged "rivalry" between England and Spain in trade and colonization, which non-Catholic historians are fond of stressing, the author shows that there was none, "except that between householder and burglar." Nor was there a "simultaneous endeavor to colonize," for down to four years before the Armada, England had not attempted colonizing. Father Hull has excellent chapters on the "Ecclesiastical Politics" of the period, "The Papal Policy" and "The Case for England." Perhaps he gives too much weight to Hubert Burke's "Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty," as an authority and he seems to be too hard on Gregory XIII. "The Spanish Armada" reflects so faithfully the mental attitude of the era it describes and refutes so effectively the misstatements with which three centuries of the Protestant tradition have filled our literature that every Catholic interested in the history of the Reformation should read Father Hull's book.

W. D.

Mr. Dooley on Making a Will and Other Necessary Evils. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.35.

"Mr. Dooley is today our wisest critic of men and affairs," wrote a competent judge some ten years ago. Whatever Mr. Dooley discusses, whether it be "Home Life," "The Higher Baseball" or "Old Age," the listener may wait for, and his expectation is seldom disappointed, a conclusion founded on wisdom and tempered with wit. Here, for instance, is Mr. Dooley's ideal of modern medical practice: "Dock O'Leary says that th' dock who shortens his prescriptions lenthens th' lives iv his patients. He says he sildom gives anny medicine that his customers cudden't ate with a soup ladle." "Uncle Mike" is commemorated in the following paragraph from "The Orange Revolution of 1914":

I wish't me Uncle Mike was alive. How he'd injye it. He'd be over there now dhrillin' th' byes. He always said he got more good out iv fightin' an Orangeman thin wan iv th' right sort because he niver felt sorry f'r it th' day afther. Th' on'y regret he'd have about th' prisint ruction is that he'd have the polis on his side. He wudden't like that much an' it might make him luke-warm.

And here is the band in the St. Patrick's day parade:

It's a German band iv coorse. Iv coorse we've got to hire the Germans. What Irishman cud ye get to blow a little pickeloo on a day like this? Th' on'y time I iver saw an Irishman musicyan in a Pathrick's Day band he'd volunteered to play th' bass-dhrum. An' I want to tell ye that dhrum knew who was th' masther before th' day was over. But niver mind. They're playin' "The Wearin' iv th' Green." Hit it up, me brave Bavaryans! More exercise with that thrombone, Looey! Stop coaxin' that dhrum, Hans! D'ye think "Th' Wearin' iv th' Green" is a lullaby?

But ivrybody is an Irishman on Pathrick's Day. Schwartzmeister comes up wearin' a green cravat an' a yard long green badge an' says "Faugh-a-ballagh, Herr Dooley" which he thinks is Irish f'r "Good morning." But ye niver can teach him annything. He's been in th' counthry forty years an' don't know th' language. Me good frind Ikey Cohen jines me an' I observe he's left th' glassware at home an' is wearin' emeralds in th' front iv his shirt. Like as not along will come little Hip Lung fr'm down th' sthreet with a package iv shirts undhr his ar-rm, an' a green ribbon in his cue.

But the Irish do more than "laugh without a reason an' fight without an objick." Dooley and Hennessy know "these things ar're on'y our diversions." "Sometimes I think we boast too much," said Mr. Hennessy. "Well," said Mr. Dooley, "it's on'y on Pathrick's Day we can hire others to blow our horns f'r us." The wit who can make two smiles flourish on a visage that nourished only frowns is a public benefactor. For his message of wisdom and wit and tears, Mr. Dooley deserves the thanks "iv th' community." The dyspeptic will find him as good a physician as the beloved "Dock O'Leary," and I am sure that Father Kelley forgot his bed-time on the night he took up this volume.

P. L. B.

Fields of Victory. By MRS. HUMPHREY WARD. With Illustrations, Colored Map and Folding Statistical Chart. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$1.50.

This neat volume of 274 pages is a well-written and interesting glorification of England's part in the war. Though its contents are for the most part known to everybody, yet the book compels attention, chiefly by reason of its crisp, rapid style. Naturally the author is partial to Britain, too much so, in fact, for she found the American army a huge *promise*, rather than a performance, even after it had borne the brunt of battle for six months. To the author's way of thinking "The war was finally won, under the supreme command of a great Frenchman, by the British army, acting in concert with the French and American armies," etc. This may be true,

but many people will continue to imagine that heroic Belgium and even Italy had something to do with the final outcome.

Britain's great feat is all the more remarkable in that, as it appears from the appended, official chart of the war from January 16 to the armistice, there were never more than 760,000 British soldiers in the line. During the time charted the average strength of the English combatants was about 500,000 men. The term "British" comprises Irish, Canadians, Australians, South Africans, New Zealanders, East Indians, Egyptians, West Indians and other colonists. At the beginning of the period charted 173,772 Irishmen from Ireland were serving with the British. Besides this Canada and Australia averaged each from three to five divisions, other colonists equaling about ten divisions, some 220,000 men. There were besides 56,000 Americans and at least 10,000 Portuguese brigaded with the English, all counted as British. England, therefore, sent into battle in France an average of 280,000, less than one-half the Americans who fought in the Argonne-Meuse battles. At the armistice there were in France 2,000,000 American soldiers, of whom 1,330,000 were combat troops. Further, of these 1,330,000, 658,000 were actually in action, 56,000 with British, 56,000 with the French and 546,000 otherwise engaged. Our casualties were 359,000, yet Britain won the war! Well, for us that her prowess was not as great in '76 and 1812, otherwise the United States would still be a colony. Be this as it may, the war has been won, America can take care of her own reputation and some day justice will be done Belgium.

G. F.

Artemus Ward. (Charles Farrar Browne.) A Biography and Bibliography. By DON C. SEITZ. With Illustrations and Facsimiles. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$2.00.

Of the minor American humorists of the middle nineteenth century, a period when John Phoenix, Josh Billings, Petroleum V. Nasby, Bill Arp and Artemus Ward were familiar names, the man last-mentioned is the only one that has finally won the distinction of a formal biography. Mr. Seitz, who lived as a boy in the town adjoining Waterford, Maine, where Artemus Ward was born in 1834, had long desired to write that humorist's life, but in the hope of securing a quantity of new material had put off bringing out the work from year to year. Numerous letters of Ward, Mr. Seitz expected to find, however, seem to have disappeared, so this well-written and fully documented biography is now published to give "present-day readers some record of the life and personality of the gentle jester at whose outpourings their fathers and grandfathers laughed."

"Charley" Browne, like William Dean Howells, Mark Twain and Joel Chandler Harris, began to write while "at the case." A vagrant printer, he journeyed from his native State to Massachusetts and thence to Ohio, where as a "local" on the Cleveland *Plain Dealer*, he first wrote his "Artemus Ward" letters, which rapidly gained a wide vogue. In 1861 Browne reached New York, subsequently becoming editor of *Vanity Fair*, a comic weekly, which soon failed, sending its editor to the lecture platform. There he won fame and a moderate fortune by "speaking a piece" called "The Babes in the Wood" from New York to San Francisco and back, preparing on the way East a lecture on "The Mormons." In 1866 the humorist went to England, beginning on November 13 a seven-weeks' engagement in London, where he was most enthusiastically received. But his career abroad was very brief, for quick consumption brought him to the grave in the spring of the following year.

In the article on "Charles Farrar Browne," contributed by Father Edward P. Spillane to the second volume of "The Catholic Encyclopedia" we read that "when he felt the end was near he asked his friend Arthur Sketchly to procure him the ministrations of a priest, 'so Sketchly' Clement Scott in-

forms us, 'took steps to carry out his friend's instructions.'"

Mr. Seitz, however, asserts that Browne did not die a Catholic. He admits that George Rose ("Sketchly"), who "was an ardent Catholic" "did express an anxious desire that the last hours of his friend should be comforted by a clergyman" and that "to this end the Rev. Father Robert Mount called three times" and according to the London *Tablet* "did, under the circumstances, what he was justified in doing for the safety of the dying man." A newspaper controversy on the subject followed, during which Dr. Kingston wrote to the *Tablet* of March 23, 1867, this letter:

As your brief obituary notice of the late lamented Artemus Ward almost implies that my late friend was a Roman Catholic, will you kindly permit me to say that Charles Farrar Browne lived and died in the Protestant faith? It is quite true that a Roman Catholic clergyman called upon him during the early stages of his last illness, and kindly tendered his spiritual offices, but those offices were respectfully and firmly declined. The same reverend gentleman also visited my poor friend on Sunday, the 3d instant; but Mr. Browne was then unconscious, and from that hour to the moment of his death existence to him was a blank, and he expired peacefully and painlessly in the presence of friends whom he loved to know, but whom he failed to recognize during the last sad days of his life. Mr. Browne had previously repeatedly assured me that he was not a Roman Catholic, and hence it was that his sorrowing friends interred his body at Kensal Green in strict accordance with the faith he always professed. The same friends would have followed his dust with equal reverence to a Roman Catholic burial if their much-lamented companion had been a follower of that faith; but Mr. Browne lived and died a Protestant, and as a Protestant he was buried.

It is hardly to be expected that Mr. Seitz's readable volume will awake today much interest in Artemus Ward's writings. The generation which found such exquisite humor in his phonetic spelling has passed away, a large part of the wit in his literary remains, it must be confessed, now falls very flat, and the general reader's taste is no doubt somewhat better now than it was in Browne's time. But the tradition of the keen enjoyment his English and American hearers of the sixties derived from Artemus Ward's lectures is persistent and those who will reread now his renowned "piece" on "The Mormons" and the press notices it received, will probably infer that that humorist's success lay largely in his engaging personality and in the ridiculously solemn manner he had of saying his funniest things.

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

"Consequences" (Knopf), is the name of a new novel by Miss E. M. Delafield, a capable English woman, who writes satirical books about convent-life. The central figure of this story is Alex Clare, a Catholic girl who from her nursery days till the end of her life is abnormally sorry for herself. The author carries Alex to a Belgian convent-school where we are asked to believe that she grew up without any knowledge of God, her religion or of herself. Disappointed in love, she enters the convent owing to her attachment to a particularly impossible mother superior, and as was to be expected, leaves it. The author knows just enough about the religious life to misrepresent it cleverly.—"Alex the Great" (Small, Maynard \$1.75) by H. C. Wittwer, chronicles the reaction to a self-created environment of a baseball manager and a young man from Vermont, who actually scoffs at Broadway. Taken in homeopathic doses, the result is a mild degree of amusement, but to read the book through at a sitting is unfair to the industrious author.—"Sanctus Spiritus and Company" (Doran, \$1.60), a novel by Edward A. Steiner, is the name their Hungarian neighbors gave to a Jewish rabbi, a Catholic priest and a Calvinistic landowner, who often walked and talked together. The story's theme is the racial problems that the new

Balkan States must try to solve and the action centers around Yanek, a young parson educated in this country. The book is not free from sordid pages.—The main difference between the widely-advertised "Light" (Dutton) by Henri Barbusse and the average penny Socialistic pamphlet, is that the Dutton publication costs 190 times as much.—"The Lay Antony," "Linda Condon" and "The Happy End" (Knopf), three books by Joseph Hergesheimer, which recently appeared in rapid succession, have chapters in them which show that he has the "power" his publisher claims for him, but the first, which is the best of the three, is a cynical, Hardy-like account of a young man's fairly successful fight against unclean temptations; the second is a weak story about a girl whose worship is "beauty," and "The Happy End" is a satirically named book of short stories full of somber and noisome episodes.

"Is There Salvation Outside the Catholic Church?" (Herder, \$0.50), which the Rev. J. L. Weidenhan, S. T. L.; has translated from the French of Father J. Bainvel, S. J., is an interesting study of the old axiom, "*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*," by a theologian well versed in the Scriptures, the Fathers and the scholastics. The author is anxious to reconcile the dogmatic truth of the axiom with the doctrine of the Church that no man is lost except through his own fault. For, as he admits, many invincibly ignorant of their error, live and die outside the true Fold. Father Bainvel solves the problem by distinguishing between an external, or visible, membership and an external, or invisible membership. In the ordinary Providence of God salvation is dependent on both external and internal union with the Church, but in unusual cases God accepts internal affiliation. In other words "*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*" is a general law which through the mercy of God suffers exception in favor of those who, though right of heart, yet through ignorance, remain outside the Fold. The book which, despite its excellent format, is cheap, is a valuable addition to spiritual literature.

A delightful book for children who like the "Alice-in-Wonderland" kind of story is E. F. Benson's "David Blaize and the Blue Door" (Doran, \$2.00), which H. J. Ford has suitably illustrated. Little David happened to find under his pillow a tiny door, so he opened it, went in and began at once to have the most absurd adventures with Miss Muffet, Uncle Popacatapetl, the Giraffe, the Rhyme family, the Brigadier-General, the Trout and many other denizens of the country that lay beyond the blue door.—Everett Tomlinson has written a good story for boys in "Sergeant Ted Cole, United States Marines" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.50). The young reader get the facts of the war in an interesting manner and plenty of adventure, too.—Another good book for boys is "Jim Morse, South Sea Trader" (Small, Maynard, \$1.25), by J. Allan Dunn. The hero will hold the attention of the youngest mind, as he makes his way among savage tribes and pearl poachers, ever doing the brave thing at the critical time.—Escott Lynn in "Knights of the Air," (Lippincott Co., \$1.50), takes his youthful readers into the world of the sky and with startling escapes and exciting air duels brings his hero through difficulties without number.

Here is a batch of recent text-books: Parke Schoch and Murray Gross, Principal and Head of the Commerce Department respectively of West Philadelphia High School for Girls, have gotten out the "Elements of Business" (American Book) as a text-book for secondary schools. Well arranged for younger minds, it offers to the average man, unskilled in business ways, a satisfactory grasp of the elementary principles of business methods, essential now for successful living.—

"New Modern Illustrative Bookkeeping" (American Book), by C. F. Rittenhouse, of Boston University, is designed as a guide and not as a substitute for the teacher. Besides giving a complete presentation of the fundamental principles of the structure of bookkeeping, unique methods impart new life and interest to the art's routine work.—"Every-day Science," (Allyn & Bacon, \$1.40), by William H. Snyder, Sc. D., is well calculated to arouse the interest of the eighth and ninth grade pupils, while the illustrations are very helpful. Simpler words should have been used in many places.—"Plant Production" (American Book), by Ransom A. Moore and Charles P. Halligan, B. S., should find a ready market among farmers who have been deprived of a scientific training. The principles of science underlying agricultural production are clearly expressed in untechnical language.—"Essentials of Arithmetic" (American Book), by Samuel Hamilton, comprises two books designed to cover the arithmetic studied from the second to the eighth grade. More stress should have been laid on "Mental Arithmetic."—"Plane and Solid Geometry" (Charles E. Merrill Co.), by Durell and Arnold, seems to have been written to meet the requirements of college-entrance examinations, although about 96 per cent. of high-school pupils do not go to college. The authors are to be commended for their logical arrangement of the various propositions and for the improvements introduced into the methods of solving original exercises.—"*Aux États-Unis*" (Allyn & Bacon), by A. de Monvert, gives an interesting description of the principal cities of this country, seen through French eyes. The use of conversational form and simple style make the book valuable for teachers who wish to teach French as a living language.

A centenary edition has appeared of the Rev. Dr. J. M. Neale's translations of "Hymns from the Eastern Church" (Macmillan). He was the first to call the Anglicans' attention to the beauties in the compositions of such early Greek hymnologists as St. Anatolius, St. Andrew of Crete, St. John Damascene, etc. Several of Dr. Neale's translations are now in common use, particularly the following "Idiomela in the Week of the First Oblique Tone," by St. Stephen the Sabaite:

Art thou weary, art thou languid,
Art thou sore distress?
"Come to me"—saith One—"and coming,
Be at rest!"

Hath he marks to lead me to Him,
If He be my Guide?
"In His Feet and Hands are Wound-prints,
And His side."

Is there Diadem, as Monarch,
That His Brow adorns?
"Yea, a Crown, in very surety,
But of Thorns!"

If I find Him, if I follow,
What His guerdon here?
"Many a sorrow, many a labor,
Many a tear."

If I still hold closely to Him,
What hath He at last?
"Sorrow vanquish'd, labor ended,
Jordan past!"

If I ask Him to receive me,
Will He say me nay?
"Not till earth, and not till Heaven
Pass away!"

Finding, following, keeping, struggling,
Is He sure to bless?
"Angels, Martyrs, Prophets, Virgins,
Answer, Yes!"

EDUCATION

The Best Way to Americanize

WHAT is the best and quickest way to Americanize the foreigner?" is a question now engaging our legislators' attention. We are told that one fertile cause of the labor troubles which prevail in this country is the fact that a large proportion of the workingmen here cannot speak the English language, have no opportunity or even desire to become American citizens, and have brought to our shores a bitter realization of Old World injustices which they feel are now continued in the New. Such men easily become the prey of radical agitators and further complicate a situation which at best is difficult to solve. Many of the capitalists who have brought over from Europe the vast throngs of laborers that make "big business" so profitable, are said to prefer that these foreign employees should never be Americanized, because their labor can be bought at a lower rate, and they can be more easily controlled. The success of a representative government like ours, however, demands a large, educated electorate. Hence the existence in various parts of the country of crowded settlements, made up of aliens ignorant of our language and unfamiliar with the nature of our institutions, cannot but be a grave menace to the American Republic. Practical suggestions that will lessen the danger should be warmly welcomed.

AMERICANIZING THE AMERICANS

LET us begin, however, with Americanizing certain Americans who are no less serious a peril to our country's well-being than the radical alien. Those steel magnates, for example, who, though they have come down from a long line of Puritan ancestors, charged the United States several times as much for steel as certain foreign nations had to pay, would seem to be fit subjects for an intensive course in Americanization. Those proud descendants of the Cavaliers, too, whose native chivalry is so sensitive that they can seldom wait for the courts to try an alleged criminal, but lynch him forthwith, and burn his body to ashes, "all the leading citizens" of the region sharing in the crime, would surely be made better Americans, if they were sent to prison for defying the law. Very defective, too, is the Americanism of the married couples who occupy the expensive apartments in our large cities, and who boast of being of "pure New England stock," but who are so selfish and pleasure-loving that they will not raise a family. In vain would our country call on them to offer her their sons and daughters in the hour of need, for they have no children to give her. Quite capable, also, of showing a far higher grade of Americanism than that they have lately displayed are the so-called "patrioteers," who protest vociferously how much they love their country, but take care meanwhile that "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" are never imperiled in the smallest degree by the sacrifices they make for the land of the free and the home of the brave. Sadly in need of Americanization, likewise, are those wealthy and well-connected "parlor Bolsheviks," who are so fond of airing their radical views at afternoon teas and, while claiming all the rights of American citizenship, shirk its duties.

OLD-FASHIONED PATRIOTS

IF the New Englanders of the eighteenth century had been content with families of but one or two pampered, anemic children instead of raising a throng of sturdy sons and daughters who learned in the home circle how to give and take and how to suffer privations cheerfully, the great wilderness of the West never would have been subdued and settled, as it was, by the hardy pioneers who left overcrowded homes in the valley of the Connecticut to fend for themselves on the shores of Erie and banks of the Ohio. But in the late war it was not the descendants of the early New Englanders who, however willing, were best able to fill the ranks of our armies. As

they no longer rear large families, of course, they had few sons to offer their country. Rather, it was from the numerous progeny of more recently arrived Americans, that the nation drew a large proportion of the sturdy man-power that made the backbone of the American Expeditionary Force, fearless young soldiers whose forefathers were Irish, German, Italian, Polish, Lithuanian and French.

The next point to note is the fact that the ancestral religion of the above-mentioned soldiers and sailors is Catholicism, and it would, of course, follow that the largest proportion of those Catholic patriots were the product of the Church's wide-spread parish-school system in this country. Much importance is now attached, and rightly so, to the nature of the influences brought to bear, in the schoolroom, on the mind and character of American children. In New York, for instance, some time ago, a teacher convicted of propagating immorality in his school, was forced to resign. But the atmosphere which permeates the parochial schools which supplied the American Expeditionary Force with so large a proportion of its best fighters is so uncompromisingly Catholic that a generous and enlightened patriotism cannot help thriving in our classrooms. The boys and girls who sit at the feet of their religious teacher, scarcely require to be reminded that they must be patriotic Americans. She needs but to teach them how to be staunch Catholics, for loyalty to our country will then follow as logically as obedience waits on love.

TO CAESAR, CAESAR'S

FOR with the Catholic the duty of loyalty to his country rests not only on the common law of nature, as is the case with his unbelieving fellow-citizens, but also on the positive Divine precept, "Give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." The Catholic school pupil, moreover, learns early in life from St. Paul that "There is no power but from God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation." Consequently to the boys and girls of the Catholic school "loyalty" and "allegiance" are sacred words, but not words merely, for they imply a love for our country and, in all things lawful, an obedience to the civil powers, that will make the little patriots ready to sacrifice cheerfully comforts, means and life itself in their country's hour of need or peril. Catholic children, while being taught in the parish school to be true to God and to His Church, and while being trained to become worthy citizens of their everlasting *patria* in heaven, are necessarily fitting themselves at the same time to be the best of Americans, for the practice of the virtues of faith, purity and obedience which will bring them safely at last to their heavenly country, will make them meanwhile just the sort of citizens the American Republic most needs today.

In this connection, worthy of consideration is the Smith-Towner bill which proposes to create a dictatorial Secretary of Education. Not only is this bill founded on a destructive principle of over-centralization, most hateful to American ideals of freedom; not only will it inevitably throw education into the grimy political arena by placing hordes of office-seeking politicians, appointed at Washington, in control of the local schools, but it will, humanly speaking, make almost impossible the continuance of those private institutions, founded and maintained at great sacrifice, by men and women who believe that only in the proportion that they are good Christians, will their children be good Americans.

CATHOLICISM THE BEST AMERICANISM

FOR the forces that now chiefly imperil our country's well-being and even her existence are those of infidelity, licentiousness and rebellion. But it is against these very powers of evil, as represented by the world, the flesh and the devil, that the strong ramparts of the Catholic school are erected.

So by teaching the boys and girls in our parish schools how to use effectively against God's enemies the three weapons He places in their hands the Church not only shows those children how to be men and women who live daily their Divine religion, but she also makes them ready to die, if need be, in defense of their country's honor.

WALTER DWIGHT, S. J.

SOCIOLOGY

Strikes and the Public

JOHN DOE does not love his employer, Richard Roe. Richard is a grasping old curmudgeon. He earned his first dollar many years ago, and that same dollar is still in captivity. He buys in the lowest market, and not even if you go down on your knees to him, will he sell except in the highest. From a safety-first point of view, his factory is a death-trap, and Richard himself, judged by the wage he pays, barely escapes indictment for the crime that calls down the vengeance of Heaven. He is deaf to all appeals for a decent wage and better working conditions, and he has announced that there is no place in his factory for the man who joins a union. He will meet his men "individually" for the redress of grievances, but he "will not receive any committee." This is about the sum of Richard's essential wickedness. Experience has shown the futility of the man-by-man style of petition. Consequently, John Doe picks up his thin pay-envelope one Saturday night, and announces that he is "through." In other words, John has gone on a strike.

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

HE has a perfect right to adopt this plan of action. His labor is his own. There is no law which can force him to work for Richard Roe, and no law to jail him if he chooses to leave Richard Roe high and dry. If he wishes he may go further than this, without exceeding the bounds of charity and justice. He may gather his fellow-workers, tell them he is quitting, and tell them why, and he may urge them to follow his example. They have real grievances. They have represented their case without redress. After John's address they conclude that the only way to bring Richard to a better frame of mind is to walk out of his factory in a body. This action simply means that the worker adds a new emphasis to his undoubted right to work or to stop work, as he deems proper. And John Doe with his striking companions need not stop at this point in their effort to right their wrongs. They may represent to other workers the true character of Richard, thereby dissuading them from entering Richard's shop, and by newspaper advertisement, handbills, pamphlets and public meetings, in the degree that these means are sanctioned by the law, spread the news that Richard is unfair to labor. By this course they aim to serve not merely themselves and the cause of labor in general, but also the public; for the existence of employers of the Richard type is a continued menace to good order. Certainly, if Richard has no right to exist as a maleficent employer, no right of his is violated in stating this fact, and urging its acceptance.

JUSTIFYING THE STRIKE

BUT John Doe may not strengthen his case by assaulting any man who wishes to take the place which he has voluntarily relinquished. If a man is free to join a union, he is free to stay out of a union, and if John Doe is free to quit a job, his neighbor is free to take it up. Nor may he drop a few pounds of TNT upon the offending factory. These and similar devices are *argumenta ad hominem et parietes*, which happen to fall under the ban of the natural law and the Decalogue. Here we begin to sense a glimmer of the truth that, while John Doe must be conceded his right to strike, this right is not without all limitation. No human rights are. Limitation does not destroy rights, but safeguards them. The right to live is limited by the duty to live decently and as a

gentleman should. If I exceed the bounds of propriety in certain instances, my right to live at all is forfeited. I have a right to hold property, and that right is safeguarded by the fact that my neighbor and I have the right to hold that property only which is our own. The right of free speech is a very precious right, but it has definite, sometimes very narrow, limits, and must have if it is to exist. So, too, of other rights. Further, if I possess a right, it does not follow that I am justified in exercising that right *semper et pro semper*, always and everywhere. Hence, while Richard Roe's iniquity may rightly be painted down to the last repulsive detail, details that are absent in the real Richard must not be inserted, and in the painting I must confine myself to the legitimate tools and devices of art. To sum up, John Doe may strike, if he has a real grievance, if there is no other way of securing redress, and if he can guarantee security for the rights of God, of Richard Roe, and of all third parties. For the rights of Almighty God must be considered, even by so august a body as the American Federation of Labor.

THE "RIGHTS" OF THE PUBLIC

THUS far it has been supposed that the product of Richard Roe's factory is a commodity not absolutely necessary to the well-being or existence of the major part of the community; or, if it falls under that category, that the suspension of Richard's productivity will not deprive the consumer of a sufficient supply of the commodity in question. Richard manufactures, let us say, hair-brushes. Most of the public could suffer an extended deprivation of hair-brushes without sore inconvenience, and some of us, permanently. But if Richard, instead of conducting this factory, is the owner of a milk-monopoly supplying a large city, or if he is the owner of a coal mine, a railroad or a street-car line, the case is altered very materially, although not essentially. Generally speaking, the closer the relation of an agent of service, or a source of production or supply to the ordinary needs of the public, the more difficult is it for the striker or strikers to furnish a guarantee that the rights of the public will suffer no injury.

Here, as always, the rights of the public, as well as of the workers and the employers, must be considered. Workers have the right to strike, individually and collectively, but they may not exercise this right to the detriment of others. Theodore Roosevelt once said that the public always suffered because it was always too slow to assert its rights. Capital has usually banked on this fact, and of late labor, too, has begun to use the public as a convenient club with which to intimidate capital.

MISGUIDED LABOR

THE public be damned" is an apt summing up of the general attitude maintained by capital during many years towards the public. Most unfortunately, during the last three years, labor has shown a disposition to install leaders who teach and act upon that precise program. It seems to be a fact that within the last six months labor has alienated a very large percentage of its friends. Men themselves near to the people, owners of small shops and factories, have earnestly endeavored to cooperate both with their employees and with the various unions, only to be rebuffed by a definitely-planned course of mendacity, contract-breaking, sabotage and general injustice, for which a parallel can be found only in the history of those two eminent masters of high finance, Jay Gould and "Jim" Fisk. Doubly unfortunate is it, that labor has alienated these friends at the opening of a period in which it will need friends as it never needed them before. The ordinary consumer has no desire to be a martyr. He is not inclined to sacrifice himself in the cause of labor, even though he be a laboring man himself. He wants his bread, his milk, his pan of coals, his railway service, his ride downtown in the morning, even his hair-brush, and he wants it "regular," and he wants it cheap. I am not trying to justify this position; I am

only stating what seems to me a fact. If he does not get it "regular," or if it is of poor quality, or if he is forced to pay a double price, because the labor union has recently won a "victory" for higher wages which the employer simply passes on to the consumer, he will incline to look upon organized labor with anything but a benign eye.

CAUGHT IN THE NET OF CAPITAL

BECAUSE of the leaders it has lately welcomed, labor has given capital the chance of its life. Capital has the money, and can buy the influence to improve on the opportunity, to restore a steel-riveted system of wage-slavery. Labor, therefore, needs all the friends it can rally. Its fight for a living-wage and for decent working conditions is absolutely just, but it will never advance that cause by belittling the rights of the public, or by defying the law. Many labor organizations need a thorough housecleaning very badly. If labor and capital cannot adjust their differences, each party has the right of appeal to the courts, should legal questions be involved, or to unbiased boards of arbitrators, now constituted in many States. Where such boards have not been established, there is the appeal to the public, and to boards of arbitration agreed upon by the contending parties. If the action of the courts does not sufficiently protect the rights of labor, the American way of securing justice is not to shoot the judge, but to change the law.

This is, first and always, a government by law. The labor organization which professes to protect the rights of the worker by putting a gun in his hand, will in the end obtain nothing for the worker except his right to remain as non-paying guest in some penal institution, or the right to occupy for a few fateful moments, the electric chair. There is no worse way of awakening a respect for my rights, than to violate your rights. When labor organizations learn this lesson to the extent of expelling the disorderly elements from their ranks, and then of taking the lead in insisting upon their legal punishment, their appeals to the public will come with a better grace and an increased effectiveness.

UNIONS NEEDED

NOT for a moment should it be suggested that labor unions are an unmixed evil. On the contrary, pending the reform of our present social and economic inequalities, I think them an absolute necessity. But nothing is ever settled, until it is settled right. A court injunction is only a truce, and a hidebound judicial decision, which considers solely the technical, as distinguished from the pertinent, facts, only adds to the sum of injustice. There may be corporations whose directors open their meetings with prayer, but I am unacquainted with their addresses, and on the other hand, I have no reason to believe that any reverence for Almighty God prompted the disturbances recently engineered throughout the country by certain labor organizations. There is the difficulty, and until it is overcome we shall continue to accept truces forced by expediency, instead of treaties of peace founded on justice. In our labor difficulties, as in so many other difficulties, we have been trying to solve the equation, with God, the chief factor, omitted.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S. J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

A Distinguished Catholic Naval Family

AN item of peculiar interest to Catholics was the launching at the New York shipyards on October 28 of the torpedo-boat destroyer *Sands*, named after two members of a distinguished Catholic naval family. Rear Admiral Benjamin Franklin Sands was a veteran of the Mexican and Civil Wars, and for many years superintendent of the United States Naval

Observatory at Washington. He was also a member of the Catholic Indian Bureau. His son, Rear Admiral James H. Sands, served with distinction in the Civil and Spanish Wars, and was superintendent of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md. He and his four brothers were educated at Georgetown University and all were devoted sons of the Church. The new destroyer is 318 feet in length and was built to move at the rate of thirty-five knots. The sponsor was Miss Jane McCue Sands, granddaughter and niece of the respective admirals. Three generations of the family were present. Among the members of the family now in religious orders are Mother M. Hilda Sands, superior of the Visitation Convent at Catonsville, Md., daughter of Admiral B. F. Sands; Madame Marie E. A. Sands, Religious of the Sacred Heart, and Sister M. Loyola Sands, of the Visitation, daughters of Mr. F. P. B. Sands; Mesdames Clara M. and Mary Hilda Sands, daughters of Admiral James H. Sands, both of whom are Religious of the Sacred Heart.

Labor Committee Reports on Steel Strike

THE report on its investigation of the steel strike has been made to Congress by the Senate Labor Committee. It asserts that employers should recognize the right of collective bargaining, but warns labor that it must rid itself of ultra-radical leadership if it expects to hold the nation's confidence. The steel strike, it charges, has been used by the "Reds" to further their own interests, and it denies the report that seven of the strikers or organizers were murdered in cold blood. To guard against further industrial commotion it suggests the following legislative program:

- (1) Establishment of a body similar to the War Labor Board with power of compulsory investigation; large power in mediation and conciliation, but no authority for compulsory arbitration.
- (2) Americanization legislation.
- (3) Federal aid as an encouragement to home-owning.
- (4) Revision of naturalization laws to require immigrants to learn English within five years after arrival in this country.
- (5) Enactment of strict laws to curb anarchists and revolutionists.

The Committee rightly concludes that there is no place in this country either for industrial despotism or labor despotism, that neither capital nor labor should be permitted to determine industrial questions in an arbitrary manner, and that it is the duty of Congress, as representing the people, to provide some means, other than the strike, for the adjustment of labor difficulties.

Tour for Tokyo University

ACROSS-CONTINENT tour for \$1,000,000 as an endowment fund for the Catholic University of Tokyo is the new missionary enterprise just launched by the Rev. Mark J. McNeal, S. J. Among the three private universities which the Japanese Government itself considers worth preserving is the Catholic University, the other two being pagan institutions. But a foundation of at least 500,000 yen, or \$250,000, is now required by a recently enacted law for the proper equipment and maintenance of each educational department in a private school. Hence the imperative need of raising this fund. It is fifteen years ago since the present Cardinal Archbishop of Boston visited Japan as an emissary of Pope Pius X and reported upon the need of a Catholic university to maintain the prestige of the Catholic cause in Japan. This in fact means the prestige of the Catholic cause throughout the Orient, since Japan, as Father McNeal points out, has now become the

strategic center of the East. The *Catholic Northwest Progress*, of Seattle, Wash., where the beginning of the new campaign was made, thus speaks of the present influence of the Jesuit professors in Japan:

Gradually the Jesuit Fathers have overcome the ancient prejudice. Before the Jesuits were admitted, a special cabinet meeting was called to pass upon the question of their entrance. Now the Japanese Government is glad to secure the services of Jesuit professors in its Imperial University and Military School. Three professors from the Catholic University of Tokyo have lectured on literature and foreign languages in the Imperial University, the Imperial High School and the Military School. Father McNeal has filled the chair of European literature in the Imperial University for a year and a half.

The Government Director of Private Schools, who at first was violently opposed to the admission of the Jesuits into Japan, is now sending his own son to the Catholic University of Tokyo conducted by them. Protestants are munificently supporting their educational institutions, Catholics cannot fail to give at least the minimum necessary to preserve and expand their own important university at this strategic center of the eastern world.

What Colleges Have Done for America

WHAT have American colleges done for American life?" A booklet issued by Middlebury College gives this statistical answer:

Less than one per cent. of American men are college graduates. Yet this one per cent. has furnished: 55 per cent. of our Presidents, 36 per cent. of the Members of Congress, 47 per cent. of the Speakers of the House, 54 per cent. of the Vice-Presidents, 62 per cent. of the Secretaries of State, 50 per cent. of the Secretaries of the Treasury, 67 per cent. of the Attorneys-General, 69 per cent. of the Justices of the Supreme Court. Though comparatively few went to college at that time, fifty-five per cent. of the men composing the Constitutional Convention were college bred.

The splendid attendance at our American colleges during the present year gives evidence of the fact that our people are rapidly learning the lesson that education means power and opportunity in life.

Anarchist-Communist Plans in America

AMONG the documents seized by the American Government officers in their raid upon the Bolshevik groups within our country is the "Manifesto of Anarchist-Communists," printed in Russian. After calling upon the members of this revolutionary body to hasten the growth of discontent, to convert small strikes into great ones, and the latter into armed revolts of the masses, the manifesto continues:

At the time of this revolt we must, at the first favorable opportunity, proceed to an immediate seizure of all means of production and all articles of consumption, and make the working classes the masters in fact of all general wealth.

At the same time we must mercilessly destroy all remains of governmental authority and class domination, liberate the prisoners, demolish prisons and police offices, destroy all legal papers pertaining to private ownership of property, all field fences and boundaries, and burn all certificates of indebtedness—in a word, we must take care that everything is wiped from the earth that is a reminder of the right to private ownership of property. To blow up barracks, gendarme and police administration, shoot the most prominent military and police officers must be the important concern of the revolting working people. In the work of destruction we must be merciless, for the slightest weakness upon our part may afterward cost the working classes a whole sea of needless blood.

Production is then to be established on a new foundation. There is to be one grand federation in which all the labor communes are to be united, and which is to develop "the magnificent beautiful form of man without a God, without a master and free of authority." Its views of religion are expressed in the old formula which has been sacred from the beginning in the literature of Socialism:

We hate religion because it lulls the spirit with lying tales, takes away the courage and faith in the power of man, faith in the triumph of justice here on the real earth and not in a chimerical heaven. Religion covers everything with fog, real evil becomes visionary, and visionary good a reality. It has always sanctified slavery, grief and tears. And we declare war upon all gods and religious fables. We are atheists.

We trust there will be short delay on the Government's part in dealing with this class of men, and greater care in excluding such hereafter.

Imaginary French Abbé Accused of Magic

A GRUESOME story of black magic, of charms and incantations, in which a priest is made to figure as the wicked enchanter and devil's tool, was recently offered as a serious news item to American readers. It appeared in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* as a syndicate story coming from a special correspondent, and copyrighted by the *New York Herald*. We are told that in the suburbs of Bordeaux was "a statue of the Virgin, which wept continuously." After some further particulars, the tale continues:

An important cult sprang up around this miracle, the high priest of which was a woman, more ardent and mystical than orthodox, who mingled with the dogmas of Catholicism in her instruction the most esoteric speculations of spiritualism. Mme. X. had at first for her colleague the Abbé Z., a Syrian priest, the vicar-general of an archbishopric. Soon there arose jealousies between them. The abbé said his adversaries sought to monopolize all the glory and material benefits of the works of the "Virgin who wept." His superiors intervened and the priest was sent to Nantes. From the moment of the departure of Abbé Z., Mme. X. languished strangely. All sorts of ills assailed her.

We refrain from giving the suggestive details that follow. Her ills she ascribed to the magical arts of the abbé. "She was certain that the abbé had molded a wax image in the shape of a woman and pronounced incantations upon it out of an ancient manual of black magic." The harm inflicted upon the image was said to have befallen her. The story ends with a supposed assault upon the abbé by certain devotees of the new cult after they had "attended Mass and Holy Communion (!)." There is no need of any further details of this disgusting story. The account ends with the statement that the names in the case cannot be made public, but that: "According to the *Matin*, the trial will be conducted in public before the Court of Correction in Bordeaux." Inquiries were immediately made by AMERICA into the origin of this fable. In reply the curé, G. Guet, of Bordeaux, has written to the Abbé, P. Flynn, curé of Suresnes, our informant, the following explanation:

It is nothing more than a fable. The story of a "Virgin who weeps" was exploited here about the years 1915 and 1916. An old butcher-woman devoted herself to mystic practices and made her shop an attraction for seekers after the marvelous. An end was soon put to this. During the past three years the story has rarely, if ever, been mentioned. As for the newspaper account, let your correspondent from AMERICA rest reassured. I repeat, it is nothing but a fable. Surely if any such events had happened here we must have heard of them.

In the meantime American readers have been regaled with such headings as: "Priest is accused by French cult" and "Abbé charged by followers of woman leader with using black magic," together with all the unsavory details that followed.